

Modern Philology

VOL. X

January 1913

No. 3

NOTES ON THE CHASTITY-TESTING HORN AND MANTLE

Among the most popular stories afloat during the Middle Ages were those of the chastity-testing horn and mantle. The former refused to carry drink to the lips of a cuckold;¹ the latter could be worn by no woman who had been untrue to her husband.

A number of versions of the horn test are preserved in the mediæval romantic literature of England and the Continent.² The story was told by Robert Biket in his *Lai du Corn* (ed. Michel in Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, 327 ff.) and by the author of one of the continuations of Chrestien de Troyes' *Perceval li Gallois* (ed. Potvin, vss. 15,640-767). An abridged form is given in *Le Roman du Renard contrefait* (Tarbé, *Poètes de Champagne antérieurs au siècle de François I^{er}*, 79 ff.).³ Versions are also found in the prose *Tristan* (ed. Löseth, *Le Roman en Prose de Tristan*, § 47), in *Il Tristano Ricardiano* (ed. Parodi, I, 324 ff.), in *La Tavola Ritonda* (ed. Polidori, I, 157 ff.), in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* (ed. Sommer, I, 324 ff.), and in the

¹ Some accounts make the wives the subjects of the probation by means of the horn. See Miss Lucy Allen Paton, *Studies in the Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance* (Radcliffe College Monograph, No. 13), Boston, 1903, pp. 105 f. See also the Irish poem printed below, pp. 5 f.

² The list of documents cited below is based on the material collected by Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, Breslau, 1883, 58 ff. and Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 257 ff. See further Miss Paton, *Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, 104 ff. For bibliography on the horn and mantle tests, see Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, 55 ff.; Child, *Ballads*, I, 271, n.; Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 104, n. 1.

With the horn should be compared Oberon's golden cup, out of which no one could drink unless he was "preudom, et nes et purs et sans pecié mortel," cited by Child from *Huon de Bordeaux*, vss. 3652-69. See further, Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 115.

³ See Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, 64; Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 113.

Orlando Furioso (Canto XLII, 70-73; XLIII, 6-44).¹ In German the motif is found in Heinrich von dem Türlin's *Crone* (ed. Scholl, vss. 466-3189), in a fifteenth-century *Fastnachtspiel* (Keller, *Fastnachtspiele aus dem fünfzehnten Jahrhundert*, p. 183, No. 127), and in a *Meistergesang* given by Bruns (*Beiträge zur kritischen Bearbeitung alter Handschriften*, II, 139).² In English it occurs in the *Cokwolds Daunce* (ed. C. H. Hartshorne, *Ancient English Metrical Tales*, 209 ff.)³ and the ballad of *The Boy and the Mantle* (Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, I, 271 ff.).⁴

The account of the wonderful mantle is preserved in almost as many versions. It was utilized by Ulrich von Zatzikhoven in his *Lanzelet* (ed. Hahn, vss. 5746-6135); and an incomplete account (probably the work of Heinrich von dem Türlin) was published by Warnatsch (*Der Mantel*, 8 ff.).⁵ Other versions are found in a *Fastnachtspiel* (Keller, *op. cit.*, II, 665, No. 81), in a *Meistergesang* (Bruns, *op. cit.*, II, 143),⁶ and in the Dutch *Lancelot* (ed. Jonckbloet, Book III, vss. 12,500-27). Two of the best known accounts are those found in the Old French *lai* of *Le Mantel Mautailié* (ed. Michel in Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, 342 ff.) and the English ballad already referred to (see Child, *Ballads*, I, 271 ff.). Summaries of the story occur in the romance of *Messire Gawain ou La Vengeance de Raguidel* (ed. Hippeau, pp. 135 ff., 3906-55) and in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scala-chronica*.⁷

Several versions of the mantle test are found in Celtic literature. A Scottish Gaelic poem in the sixteenth-century *Book of the Dean of Lismore* was published in 1862 by Rev. Thomas McLauchlan, and since then several times by other editors.⁸ A similar Irish ballad was published in 1892 by Alexander Macbain and John Kennedy in the

¹ See Child, *Ballads*, I, 265, n.; Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 105, n. 3.

² For other versions, see Child, *Ballads*, I, 263, n. Cf. Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, 77; Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 107 ff.

³ Cf. Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, 68.

⁴ For other forms of virtue tests, see Child, *Ballads*, I, 266 ff., III, 503; Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, 80 ff.

⁵ See also Child, *op. cit.*, I, 259, n.

⁶ See Child, *op. cit.*, I, 261, n., and Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, 74.

⁷ See Wolf, *Ueber die Lais*, 376 f.; Thos. Wright, *Arch. Cambrensis*, 3d ser., IX, 10 and n. Several late prose versions are mentioned by Child, *op. cit.*, I, 258. See also Miss Paton, *op. cit.*, 119 f., and Warnatsch, *op. cit.*, 72.

⁸ For bibliography, see *Modern Philology*, I (1903), 145.

Reliquiae Celticae, a posthumous collection of the works of Alexander Cameron. By far the most important contribution was made by L. C. Stern, who in 1896 published in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, I (1896-97), 294 ff., a version found in the seventeenth-century *Duanaire Fhinn*, at the same time adding a discussion of the various forms of the story.¹ Finally, in 1903 Professor Robinson printed in this journal (I, 192 ff.) a version from a nineteenth-century Irish MS in the library of Harvard University.

That the stories of the chastity-testing horn and mantle found in the mediaeval romances and lays of England and the Continent originated on Celtic soil, was maintained in 1883 by Warnatsch (*Der Mantel*, 58) and more recently by Miss Paton (*Fairy Mythology of Arthurian Romance*, 118). Stern (*Zt. f. Celt. Philol.*, I, 310) apparently favors the same view.²

The evidence here, as in other questions of Celtic origin, must be handled with the utmost care. Early Welsh literature furnishes but scant testimony. According to a collection of Welsh triads found in a thirteenth- or fourteenth-century MS, Tegau Eurvron, one of the three virtuous ladies of King Arthur's court, possessed a mantle which no unchaste woman could wear. According to another text, she owned a chastity-testing horn.³ In spite of the possibility that these passages embody genuine Celtic tradition,⁴ they cannot be regarded as very convincing. On the other hand, Goidelic literature furnishes us with a body of material which, though at first blush appearing equally unsatisfactory, is in reality of considerable importance. The fact that the Irish and Scottish Gaelic poems cited above are preserved only in late MSS, coupled with our inability to determine, from an examination of these documents alone, exactly how far they are based on native tradition, might lead us to infer

¹ Stern mentions other versions in MSS *ss. C. 51* and *ss. G. 51*, in the library of the Royal Irish Academy. To these I add the following list gathered from the unpublished catalogue of Irish MSS in the same library: *ss. A. 23*, *ss. A. 47*, *ss. C. 10*, *ss. K. 18*, *ss. L. 8*. Professor Robinson cites an apparent reference in S. H. O'Grady's *Catalogue of Irish MSS in the British Museum* to another copy in MS, *Egerton 176* (*Mod. Philol.*, I, 146, n. 4). See also Bodleian MS, *Ir. C. 2* (pp. 45 ff., 175 ff.), a collection of English translations of Fenian poems.

² Cf. K[ittredge] in *Child's Ballads*, V, 289.

³ Cited by Stern, *Zt. f. Celt. Philol.*, I, 304 f. See also Warnatsch, *Der Mantel*, 59; Child, *Ballads*, I, 265 f.

⁴ See J. E. Lloyd, *A History of Wales*, Longmans, 1911, I, 122, n.

that the presence of the mantle in Celtic literature is due to Continental or English influence; but before judging too hastily, we must remember one or two things. First, a large amount of Celtic literature is and has been for centuries, lost beyond recovery;¹ consequently the absence of a given feature from early extant documents by no means proves the non-Celticity of the feature in question. It has been demonstrated that the lateness of an Irish MS cannot be taken as proof that the documents contained therein are of equally recent date.² The Gaelic ballad of the mantle may, therefore, contain material of a high degree of antiquity. Moreover, the barbaric character of the narrative, as well as its eminently Celtic smack, may certainly be accepted as some evidence that it is of native growth and is not merely a late adaptation of foreign material.³ Finally, scattered through Irish documents composed of material antedating the earliest English or Continental versions of the horn and mantle stories, there exist scraps of tradition which prove that the ancient Celts were familiar with similar tests.⁴

¹ For references on this point, see *Revue Celtique*, XXXI (1910), 428, n. 2. See also *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, 1st ser., IX (1861-62), 16 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 448, and n. 1. Cf. Meyer, *Royal Ir. Acad., Todd Lect. Ser.* XVI (1910), xv, xxix.

³ These facts should be considered in connection with the considerable amount of collected material pointing toward the origin of a large body of mediaeval romance in Celtic tradition. I am planning to publish as soon as possible a detailed comparison between the mediaeval romances and early Celtic literature.

⁴ Tests by means of natural objects are described in the so-called *Scél na Fir Flatha* (Tale of the Ordeals), a document which, though found in no MS earlier than the fourteenth-century *Yellow Book of Lecan*, contains "the fullest account extant of the twelve ordeals of the ancient Irish" (Whitley Stokes, *Irish Texts*, III, 1, Leipzig, 1891, 183 ff). The *Ordeals* mention a crystal vessel alleged to have belonged to a king named Badurn, who acquired it in the following manner. On one occasion Badurn's queen went to a fountain, "and at the well she saw two women out of the fairy-mounds (*da mnai as na sidhaib*). . . . When they beheld the woman coming toward them they went under the well, and in the fairy-mound she saw a marvelous ordeal, even a vessel of crystal. If a man should utter three false words under it, it would separate into three (parts) on his hand. If a man should utter three true words under it, it would unite again" (*Ir. Text.*, III, 1, 191). Of a similar character is the truth-testing vessel owned by Manannan mac Lir (one of the most famous early Irish supernatural beings), and mentioned in the *Eachtra Cormaic i Tir Tairngiri* (Adventures of Cormac in the Land of Promise [the Celtic Other-World]): *Ir. Text.*, III, 1, 197 f., 215 f. Cf. the version printed in the publications of the *Ossianic Society*, III, 220. There is also an apparent reference to Manannan's cup in a fifteenth-century version of the well-known *Oídeo mac n-Uisnig* (Death of the Sons of Usnech), *Ir. Text.*, II, II, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 134, 163. It should be noted that in all these cases the magic vessel, like the horn and mantle in the English and Continental poems, is an other-world object. (See further *Silva Gadelica*, II, 264 f., 521; Miss Paton, *Fairy Mythology*, 112; and an unpublished portion of my dissertation on *Mediaeval Romance as Illustrated by Early Irish Literature* (Harvard University, 1909), 347, n. 1 (see above, p. 4, n. 3).) In connection with these matters it is important to remember

Perhaps some light may be thrown on the subject by the evidence of two Irish poems which I chanced upon several years ago while investigating manuscripts in the library of the Royal Irish Academy, in Dublin. The first is found in MSS 23.D.7 (p. 56) and *Stowe*, *F.V.3* (pp. 251 f.), both of which are probably not earlier than the eighteenth century.¹ The following text is based on the Stowe copy.

Táinig go teaghlach righ an domhain
grúagach déidgheal daitheamhuil;
eala na láimh leis don mbrugh,²
ag siubhail go sáimh ar slabhradh.

There came to the household of the king of the world
a white-toothed, comely gruagach;
[he came] to the palace [with] a swan in his hand,
walking quietly attached to a chain.

Ba misde mna fios a rúin³
a tteaghlach Ching éadmhair⁴ Ártúir-
sgéal⁵ on eala bhinn bhuig,
da bhfearaibh as tinn táinig.

Were worse for the knowledge of their secret the women
of the household of jealous King Arthur—
a tale from the tender, sweet swan,
it is painfully it came to their husbands.

that in certain versions of the story of the Holy Grail, the grail (which is pretty certainly in origin a Celtic other-world treasure) acts as a virtue-test. See Alfred Nutt, *Studies in the Legend of the Holy Grail*, 74 ff.; Schofield, *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, New York, 1906, p. 199. Cf. my dissertation, pp. 380 f.; Arthur C. L. Brown, "The Bleeding Lance," *Publications of the Mod. Lang. Ass'n. of Amer.*, XXV (1910), 57.

The *Scél na Fírlatha* also furnishes an interesting parallel to the wonderful mantle. One Morann mac Main is said to have possessed three collars which either detected or prevented falsehood on the part of those who wore them. One of these was brought by the king's fool from *Síd Ar Féin*, a well-known subterranean fairy palace in Munster. *Adcon[n]aire-sium iain sidh bad n-a ret is in deiligid fir 7 gai* and: "He saw in the fairy-mound that it was the thing (used) there in distinguishing between truth and falsehood" (*Ir. Text.*, III, 1, 190, 208). Cf. Keating, *History of Ireland*, *Irish Texts Soc.*, II (1908), 237, III (1908), 35.

¹ A copy of the poem found in MS, *Egerton 127* (p. 53, new numbering p. 33), British Museum, and headed *Tri rainn 7 abrán*, agrees in general with the Stowe text.

² don mbrugh; 23.D.7, on brugh. Perhaps we should adopt the latter reading and hence translate "from the palace," as the word *brugh* is often used in Irish to indicate one of those magnificent other-world dwellings inhabited by the fairy-folk (*aes síde*). If this rendering be correct, the *gruagach*, like other possessors of magic virtue-testing objects (see above, p. 4, n. 4), is of supernatural origin. On Celtic fairy palaces, see *Revue Celtique*, XXXI (1910), 462, n. 1, and my dissertation, p. 322 and n. 4. See also word *brug* in "Index of Places" to *Ir. Text.*, IV, 1.

³ 23.D.7 interchanges the second and third stanzas.

⁴ 23.D.7, eadúir.

⁵ 23.D.7, sgéala.

Ni ghéabhadh¹ an t-éan tain on tuinn
biadh san mbrúgh² on mnai altruim;
ni gheubhadh³ on mnai mbaisghil mbáin
gan fíon go mblasmhil d'fághail.⁴

The gentle bird of the wave would not take
food in the palace from a fostering woman;
it would not take anything from a fair, white-handed woman
unless it got wine with taste of honey.

AN T-ABRAN⁵

An eala mhaiseach do-tharraing⁶ an gruagach réidh,⁷
nach géubhadh⁸ beatha san teach sin ambúailfed⁹ sé
acht¹⁰ fíon dathghlan¹¹ do¹² bhasuibh na suarc bhan séimh
nach dean malairt ar a bhfearaibh uair san sáeghal.

The beautiful swan which the noble gruagach led,
which would not take food in any house into which it
entered,
except pure-white wine from the hands of the gentle,
modest women
Who never did injury to their husbands.

The second poem is contained in the nineteenth-century paper
MSS 23.D.18 (pp. 350-395, incl.) and 23.K.18 (p. 185, l. 5-p.
209, l. 20), in the library of the Royal Irish Academy. An incom-
plete version, lacking the episode of the virtue-test, was printed in
1893 at Baile-átha-cliath (Dublin) by Padruig O Briain in his
Blaithféasg de Mhílseáinibh na Gaoidheilge, a volume whose title Mr.
O Briain renders by the seductive English appellation of "A Garland

¹ 23.D.7, Nír ghábh.

² san mbrugh; 23.D.7, san mbith (at all; lit., in the world).

³ 23.D.7, níór ghabh.

⁴ For this line 23.D.7: reads *gan fíon deaghbhlas[ta] ghil d'fághail* (unless it got sweet-flavored fair wine).

⁵ Also spelled *amhran*; the name of the meter in which the *ceangal* (recapitulation) is written. Another poem whose *ceangal* is written in the *Amhran* meter is given in the *Duanaire Dháibhidh Uí Bhruadair* (The Poems of David Ó Bruadair, *Irish Texts Society*, XI, Pt. I, 1910, pp. 11 ff.). For this note, as well as for the interpretation of the word *abran*, I am indebted to Professor Robinson.

⁶ 23.D.7, do-thaisdiol (?).

⁷ *Stowe*, leith (gray).

⁸ 23.D.7, gabhann.

⁹ sin ambúailfed; 23.D.7, ann ambualann.

¹⁰ 23.D.7, gan.

¹¹ 23.D.7, deaghbhlata (sweet-flavored), after which is added *d'fághail* (to get, getting).

¹² 23.D.7, o.

of Gaelic Selections." The quotations in the following summary are based as far as possible on the printed text, and, where that fails, on MS 23. K. 18.

CATH NA SUIRIDHE (BATTLE OF THE COURTSHIP)

The poem, like most other Fenian tales, takes the form of a dialogue between Patrick and Oisín. The saint excites the old warrior's ire by telling him that though he has passed successfully through many conflicts,

Atá aon chath fós gan dul thort,
There is yet one battle you will not escape.

Oisín, on hearing that the contest referred to is the Battle of Death, expresses his belief that Death is no longer to be feared, for it was he or his like who fell in the Battle of the Courtship. Patrick immediately scents a story:

Cread é an cath sin, a séanoir bhláith,
Ionar thuit, mar saoiltear leat, an bás?
Innis dam gach ní gan bhreug—
Tásg an chatha do bhí treun.

What is that battle, O fair old man,
In which, as it seems to you, Death fell?
Tell me everything without deceit—
The account of the battle, which was fierce.

The saint's solicitations are, as usual, effective, and the old Fenian tells the following story:

Finn and his band, while hunting one day, were met by a fairy woman of marvelous beauty, who invited them to her *dun*. On their arrival she bound them by magic and played various tricks on Conan Maol.¹ Finn, in order to discover a method of getting himself and his companions out of their scrape, bit his thumb with his "tooth of knowledge"² and by so doing learned that they could be released if he kissed their hostess.

¹ The Thersites of the Fenian band.

² On Finn's "tooth of knowledge," see *Ir. Text.*, IV, I, 1.203 and n.; *Macgnimartha Finn*, Eriu I, 186 (cf. *Publins. of The Gaelic Soc.*, Dublin, 1881, 48, 67 f.); *Revue Celtique* XIII (1892), 16, 21, XIV (1893), 246 f.; O'Curry, *MS Materials of Ancient Ir. Hist.*, 396; *J. of the Galway Arch. and Hist. Soc.*, III (1903-4), 160; MacCulloch, *Religion of the Ancient Celts*, Edinburgh, 1911, 248 f. Cf. Andrew Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion*, Longmans, 1906, II, 37.

Do faisneis an meur do Fionn go beacht
 Gach sgeul díreach bhí le teacht,
 'S d'á ngoidfeadh sé póg ó'n mhnaoi,
 Go raibh a geasa gan aon bhrigh.

The finger told Finn perfectly
 Every certain event that was a-coming,
 And that if he stole a kiss from the woman,
 Her spells would be powerless.

Do fuair Fionn annsin uain,
 'S do thug póg do'n mhnaoi gan guais.
 "Le buadh feasta," do ráidh an bhean, "a Finn;
 D'fágabais mo gheasa gan aon bhrigh."

Then Finn found opportunity,
 And he gave the woman a kiss without danger
 "Success to thee henceforth," said the woman, "O Finn;
 You have left my spells powerless."

Do sín fionn an Riogan chaomh;
 is fiór—ní bréag—gur chionntaig lé.
 d'fóir sí ann sin an fiann go huimlán
 ó pheanid agus ó chrúadh chás.

Finn approached the fair queen;
 It is true—no deceit—he sinned with her.¹
 She freed the Fenians all together
 From punishment and distress.

Hereupon the lady became extremely alarmed over the loss of
 her virtue. Addressing the chief of the Fenians, she said:

"As baoghal liomsa, a finn mhaic cúmhaill, a ghrádh,
 gur thréagas leatsa mho dheagh-chlú go brách;
 tá mo cheile amuith mar so ar cúaird,
 ag iára cochall ionnracaís na mbuadh."

¹ The two following stanzas (found only in the MSS), explain in greater detail the
 method here suggested as that used by Finn in freeing his comrades from the fée's spells:

"Racham annois," do rádh fionn áig.
 "chum súain go beacht láimh ar láimh,
 ag déanamh grinn is suaircíos re cheile
 gan smuít chadlata na tromm nealta."

Do bhúall fionn a mhéur go réig
 annsa tséan tsíoda do bhí ar a taobh;
 do thóg an bhean leis í faoi tséoil
 ar leabuin chum grinn is spóirt

"I fear, O Finn mac Cool, my love,
That I have left with you my good fame for ever;
My husband is out on a visit,
Seeking the mantle of chastity of virtues."

"Tíocfadh féin sa choimhdeachta eile anocht,
'Gus deilbh leis mise do bheidh san locht;
nochtaig an cochall mo mhíodh-rún,
is do gheabhad masla agus miodh-chlú."

"He himself will come and the rest of his company
tonight,
And it will appear to him that I am in fault;
The mantle will lay bare my evil secret,
And I shall get reproach and ill fame."

When Finn questioned her about the magic qualities of the mantle she replied:

"Buádh an chochall úd, a fin mhaic cúmhail;
ná fúaras guith ná miodh-chlú
ná nochtaig an cochall go beacht
do neach ar bith 'nar mhiannfeas."

"The virtue of that mantle, O Finn mac Cool, [is that
there]
Was never heard [lit., found] report of ill fame
[That] the mantle will not lay bare completely
For any one at all who desires to know"(?).

At this point the Fenians heard a fierce cry at the door, and the fée's husband appeared.

D'féach iona thímphchioll go feargach borb
an tan do ráine sé tar dorus.
do bhí cochallán aon tsnáithe na laimh,
do sléamhuin tsíoda dob oírdhearc fál.

He looked around fiercely and roughly
When he entered the door.
There was in his hand a great mantle made of a single thread
Of smooth silk which was an excellent covering.

Before the giant could apply the virtue-testing mantle to his wife, there arrived twenty of his kinsmen, accompanied by an equal number of women. Among these were his son, Mór-Šúileach-Caolchosac (Great, Sharp-sighted, Slender-footed One), and the latter's wife, Crúadh-Chás (Hard Case).

D'fafa mór-súileach cá raibh an cochlán
 nó go bfaigheadh fios ionnraais a mhná.
 do fúair sé an cochlán go dían
 ó na mháthar le lán toil mhiann.

Mór-Súileach asked where the mantle was,
 That he might obtain knowledge of the chastity of his wife.
 He got the mantle quickly
 From his mother to his heart's desire (?).

Ann sin do chuirr an cohall ar an mhnai,
 is do fúair go raibh sí lán tsaoir.
 do cuireadh an cohall ar an iomlán
 dona mnaibh is do adhbhar bróin agus ochlán.

Then he placed the mantle on his wife,
 And he found that she was fully exempt.
 The mantle was placed on the whole number
 Of the women, and it was a cause of sorrow and distress.

The general test of course included Mór-Súileach's mother, who as a result was proved guilty of unchastity. Speedy punishment followed:

Do nocht caolchosach a ghear lann,
 is do theilg dá mháthar a ceann.

Caolchosach bared his sharp blade,
 And cut off his mother's head.

For this act of violence he was slain by Finn.

In the MSS Oisín, having now recited more than a hundred stanzas, has apparently got his second wind, for he goes on to tell the story of Cab an Dosan, which forms the subject of one of the better known Ossianic lays. In the printed version he ends the day's entertainment at the completion of the Battle of the Courtship, closing his tale with the following stanza:

"Sin agat, a chleirigh chaidh chaoín,
 tuarasgbháil chatha na Suiridhe,
 'S má bhí an daol-bhás riamh ann,
 Is ann do teilgeadh de a cheann."

"There's for you, O holy, fair cleric,
 The description of the Battle of the Courtship;
 And if black Death ever existed,
 It is then that his head was cut off."

Far be it from me to darken counsel by words without knowledge, yet I cannot refrain from suggesting that in the first of these poems the peculiar form of the test,¹ in the second the fact that the mantle is utilized in a poem which bears no other possible trace of non-Celtic material, may furnish some indication, however slight, that chastity-tests similar to those found in the English and Continental stories of the horn and mantle were familiar to the ancient Irish—that I have accidentally fished up out of “the backward and abysm of time” a scrap or two of genuine Celtic tradition, that tradition from whose detritus have been gathered so many stones for the great palace of mediaeval romantic literature. *Tuigeann fear léighinn leath-focal.*

TOM PEETE CROSS

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

¹ Although the occurrence of the name “Arthur” in the poem indicates the acquaintance of the author or redactor with Arthurian romance, the swan as a virtue-test does not appear, so far as I am aware, in a single non-Celtic version of the story. This is not the only appearance of Arthur in an otherwise typically Irish story. See, for example, *Agallamh na Senorach*, *Silva Gadelica* II (1892), 105 f., 212. The situation is entirely different in the case of the *Eaitra an Mdra Maoil* and the *Eaitra Macaoim-an-iolair*, two Irish Arthurian romances published in 1908 by R. A. Stewart Macalister for the *Irish Texts Society*; probably the former, certainly the latter, is based on a French original (see *Gaelic Journal*, XLIX (1909), 357, n. 5). Yet even into these the Irish redactor has evidently introduced features derived from Gaelic literature or tradition. On Arthur in early Irish literature, see Patrick M. Mac Sweeney, *Irish Texts Society*, V (1904), xxiv f., and my paper read before the Modern Language Association of America at Philadelphia in December, 1912.

NEW ANALOGUES OF OLD TALES¹

The enormous extent of the literature of *exempla* has recently been disclosed by the publication of the third volume of the *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of MSS in the British Museum*, London, 1910. In this volume the editor, Mr. J. A. Herbert, describes and analyzes 109 MSS and refers to over eight thousand stories. These are all contained in collections, made largely for the use of preachers. Many preachers, however, invented or selected their own illustrative stories and the great number in Herbert's *Catalogue* could easily be increased by *exempla* in the innumerable collections of sermons found in all Continental libraries. A selection of 115 of such individual *exempla* is offered in the text before us, taken from MSS in the Royal and University libraries of Breslau, ranging from the end of the twelfth to the end of the fifteenth century. The principle of selection is thus stated by the editor: "Aufnahme fanden nur solche Stücke, die in den Handschriften entweder ohne alle Quellenangabe angeführt sind, oder deren Quellen uns heute nicht mehr bekannt sind." There are exceptions, however, as p. 76, No. 76, "Legitur exemplum in libro de dono timoris." The editor concedes that the investigator can without difficulty discover the sources of some of the *exempla*, and analogues for others. The editor himself gives a few, but in general limits his remarks to the age and origin of the MSS in which the *exempla* are contained. Finally, he admits that certain stories are, properly speaking, not *exempla*, as they are taken from *chronicles*, but claims that they belong in this selection since they contain materials encountered in *exempla*. Such are: No. 2, "De Alexandro Magno"; No. 3, "De itinere Karoli Magni in Orientem"; No. 4, "Quomodo Karolus Magnus reliquias ex oriente apportaverit"; No. 6, "De Karolo Magno et Rolando"; No. 7, "Amicus et Amelius"; No. 8, "De Oggero et Presbytero Johanne"; No. 16, "De Udalrico episcopo, cui animae in specie avicularum apparuerunt," etc. Brief references to sources are given in the notes to these.

¹ *Exempla aus Handschriften des Mittelalters* herausgegeben von Joseph Klapper. (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte herausgegeben von A. Hilka. 2.)

An interesting *exemplum* of the class of *novelle* is the first "Salvatica," a variant of the story of "The Maiden without Hands," Grimm, No. 31. The most important individual *exemplum* is No. 46, "De ebrio, qui defunctum invitavit." This is the earliest version of the Don Juan story yet discovered. It is contained in a fifteenth-century collection of sermons, and is credited to a book named *Annulus*, otherwise unknown to me. There is a curious version of the same theme in Herbert's *Catalogue*, p. 562, from MS Harley 268, of the second half of the fourteenth century. In digging foundations for a church, the workmen find an old sarcophagus. When they go to dinner they ask, "Who will look after our tools?" Their employer, a knight, answers, "The man in that sarcophagus, and presently he shall have dinner too." When the workmen return, the dead man appears at the door of the knight's castle and demands admission. He refuses meat and drink, saying that masses are his only food, and that he still wants forty to free him from purgatory. The knight has these said for him, and afterward sees him dressed in white, riding on a white horse.

Of the *exempla* to which Klapper gives no references whatever, but for which I have found sources or analogues, the following may be mentioned:

No. 17, "De beato Germano, qui animabus subvenit." This is the story of the priest sprinkling holy water in the cemetery and the dead reaching up their hands to receive it. The same story is in the *Speculum laicorum*, credited to "Odo de Seriton"; see Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 383, and variants, pp. 463, 464.

No. 19, "De custode S. Petri, qui gaudia et penas aeternitatis vidit." This is the well-known vision of the sacristan of St. Peter's which led to the institution of the festival of All Saints; see *Legenda aurea*, ed. Graesse, p. 727.

No. 29, "De abbatisa, quae vidit neptem suam damnatam." See Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 471.

No. 30, "Quomodo Herodias punita sit." See *Legenda aurea*, p. 573.

No. 31, "De divite, quem diabolus sustulit de sepulcro." A similar story is in Caesarius Heisterb., *Dial. Mirac.*, XI, 39; *Scala celi*, Ulm, 1480, f. 168; see also Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 497, 499, 500.

No. 32, "De procuratore infideli, qui daemonibus traditus est." A king going on a journey intrusts his only daughter to a certain officer to guard. The faithless officer wrongs his charge and upon the king's return is flayed and his skin thrown to demons dwelling in a certain mountain. The story seems to be a variant of the one in *Gesta Romanorum*, No. 27, "Tochter anvertraut, strafe."

No. 34, "De milite, cui apparuit amicus mortuus, de quo male locutus erat." See Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 280 (*Manuel des péchés*), 310 (*Handlyng Synne*), 318 (*Manual of Sins*), 386 (*Speculum laicorum*, No. 222, attributed to "Odo de Seriton"), 463, 588.

No. 36, "De sacerdote, qui cotidie missam pro defunctis celebravit." The bishop suspends a priest who frequently celebrates mass for the dead, and is threatened by the dead as he passes through the cemetery; see *Legenda aurea*, p. 733, credited to "Petrus Cluniacensis"; see also Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 383 (*Speculum laicorum*, No. 158), 456, 468, 473, 686.

No. 37, "De sacerdote, quem mortui in cimeterio detinuerunt." A priest who never prays for the dead is seized by the foot as he is passing through a cemetery and not released until he promises to pray for the dead; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 661, 693.

No. 38, "De viro sancto, cui defuncti responderunt." The dead respond "Amen" in mass; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 383 (*Speculum laicorum*, No. 162, 163), 463, 464. The stories in the *Speculum laicorum* are credited to Odo of Cheriton.

No. 41, "De pena adultorum." A similar story of two who sinned only in their hearts because they had no time or place to sin in reality is in Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 10 (48b, credited to *Jacques de Vitry*, but not in my edition), 122, 690.

No. 42, "De pena eorum, qui voluntatem morientium non faciunt." A dying rich man invokes on each of his three executors particular evils as penalties for breach of trust, and all the penalties are incurred; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 389 (*Speculum laicorum*), 419 (*Liber exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti*), 472, 635 (MS Additional 33956), an interesting localized version; "William Chansonier, a usurer at Bynns," appoints as his executors a priest named Boneth and two friends, invoking leprosy, "ignis infernalis" (erysipelas?), "ignis sancti Anthonij" in Klapper, and sudden death as

penalties for breach of trust. All three prove faithless, Boneth is admitted to the leper hospital "apud Hervers," the second executor dies of "ignis infernalis" at Vienne, and the third falls and breaks his neck. The beginning is "Narravit frater quidam Anglicus qui venit de Alufia" (?Aluernia, Auvergne). A similar story is in the *Scala celi*, f. 85.

No. 43, "De Viro, quem defuncti ab inimico liberaverunt." A man who was wont to pray for the dead is protected by them when his enemies pursue him through the cemetery; see Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 383 (*Speculum laicorum*, "Refert Cantor Parisiacus," i.e., Petrus Cantor Parisiensis), and many other references. This favorite story is also in the *Legenda aurea*, p. 733, and *Scala celi*, f. 133 vo.

No. 47, "An suffragia damnatis prosint." The legend of Judas released from punishment every Sunday; see *Voyage of Saint Brandan*; Ward, *Cat.*, II, 528. Jubinal's text is reprinted in Douhet, *Dictionnaire des légendes*, Paris, 1855, col. 724.

No. 48, "De avaro mortuo, cuius intestina bufo comedebat." The story of a miserly dean in England who dies and is told by an angel that he may hope for mercy if he can get a penny from his money-bag. He finds a devil sitting upon it and is carried to hell. He appears to the bishop and asks that his body be removed from the church in which it was buried "quia propter hoc in inferno durius torquebatur." A great toad is found in his tomb devouring his heart. The same story is found in Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 474; MS Egerton 1117, end of thirteenth century.

No. 52, "De annulo, quem sancta Agnes suscepit." See *Legenda aurea*, p. 116.

Nos. 54, 57, "De iuvene, qui se per confessionem a diabolo liberavit," and "De iuvene, qui per penitentiam a diabolo liberatus est." Two stories of a youth who is tempted by the devil to sin but confesses, and can no longer be recognized by the devil. The second story is in the *Scala celi*, f. 43, credited to E. de Bourbon, "Septem Donis Spiritus Sancti." The main idea of these stories, the inability of the devil to recognize his victim after confession, is a very common one; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 284 (*Manuel des péchés*), 311 (*Handlyng Synne*), 483, 525, 542, 551, 561, 604, 649; in these the sinner is generally chained to the devil, but escapes long enough to

make confession, and thus becomes unrecognizable to the devil. Sometimes a black mark is affixed by the demon and disappears at confession; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 578, 639. Sometimes the written record of sins is blotted out; see Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 639, where a hermit meets a devil in human form with a record of his sins, and persuades him to wait while he goes to confession; when he returns they find the record expunged. These stories are variants of the class where the penitent is unable from his or her tears to make an oral confession, and a written one is submitted to the bishop or priest and the writing is expunged. See my references to *Jacques de Vitry*, 301.

No. 56, "De iuvene, quem os monstruosum deglutire nitebatur," a very curious story of a youth tempted by the flesh who saw an enormous head with a mouth large enough to swallow a camel. At length he is freed from his temptation and the head joining itself to a huge body disappears in a well. The only other version of this story which I have seen is in Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 472 (MS Egerton 1117, cited above).

No. 61, "De milite Ludovici, qui periuramentum interfecit." See *Jacques de Vitry*, 219, and Etienne de Bourbon, No. 385, p. 340.

No. 65, "De diabolo, qui claustrum intrare non potuit." On a certain Christmas Eve the Virgin with the Child in her arms appeared to Hugo, abbot of Cluny. The Child said: "You are celebrating my nativity with great rejoicing. What can the devil now do or say and where now is his power?" Then the devil was seen to rise up from the ground and say: "I cannot enter thy church because thy praises are sung there, but I can enter the chapter-house and dormitory and refectory." He attempts to do so but finds the door of the chapter-house too narrow, that of the dormitory too low, and that of the refectory barred by the sobriety of food and drink. This story is in Petrus Venerabilis, *De miraculis* (Migne, CLXXXIX, col. 880), and in Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 607, credited to "Vita Petri Cluniacensis." The story is also in Etienne de Bourbon (MS Additional 28682, f. 230 b, beginning, "Legitur in libro Petri Cluniacensis quod abbas Hugo Cluniacensis retulit de se quasi de alio").

No. 66, "De diabolo, qui fragmina psalmorum collegit." See *Jacques de Vitry*, XIX, and parallels there cited. To these may be added: *Liber de abundantia exemplorum*, f. 66, *Jacob's Well* (Early

English Text Society, No. 115), p. 114, and Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 354 (Caesarius, IV, 9), 555, 584, 628, 701, 705.

No. 71, "De lictore occiso, qui ante mortem confessus est." A certain lictor is killed in the performance of his duty. A priest, passing through the cemetery that same night, sees the trial of the soul of the lictor and its defense by the Virgin. The soul is permitted to return to the body and repent. This story belongs to the class represented in Ward, *Cat.*, II, 663, 676; see references in my edition of the *Miracles of the Virgin* (*Romanic Review*, II, 235-79), No. 4.

No. 72, "De peccatore, cui sancta Barbara gratiam confessionis impetravit." In Glogovia in 1396 a certain Paulus Haman was broken on the wheel, but lived until the third day and asked a woman passing by for drink. She reported the fact and the torturer tried to kill the criminal with an axe but could not. He said that he could not be killed until he had received communion, and that this was through the intercession of Saint Barbara. As soon as he received communion he died. The classical story of this kind is that of "Ebbo the Thief"; see my edition of the *Miracles of the Virgin*, No. XI. A story similar to Klapper's is in Caesarius, IX, 49.

No. 74, "De rustico, qui sanctum Thomam sorte eligit." A rustic refuses to take the doubting apostle as his patron and is told to go to Jerusalem where he will find a more powerful one. During a storm he is thrown into the sea as the unlucky Jonah selected by lot. Saint Thomas rescues him. Later he refuses to follow his companions home on a feast day, and the saint conducts him home miraculously, and gives him a writing containing his name. This is found to be that of Saint Thomas. The rustic's comrades return later and bear witness to his story. That part of the story in which a person in a foreign land is brought home in a miraculous manner is in Caesarius, VIII, 59, and is the plot used by Boccaccio, *Decameron*, X, 9. See Rajna's discussion of the story in the *Romania*, VI (1877), 359-68. Another case of rapid transit is in Caesarius, X, 2; see also *Scala celi*, f. 53, and Thomas Cantapratanus, II, 40, 3.

No. 75, "De medico, qui sanctum Thomam sorte eligit." The duke of Lorraine summons his physician, a devotee of Saint Thomas, after whom he is named, to cure his eyes. The physician is delayed in compounding the medicine, and the duke exclaims: "O quando

veniet ille diabolus?" and straightway the devil appeared in the guise of the true physician and blew into the duke's eyes a powder which caused them to fall out and threw at him a medicine-box which killed him. The true physician is thrown into prison until the citizens can decide on the mode of his death. Meanwhile the duke's soul is disputed in the usual fashion by angels and demons. Finally Saint Thomas puts the demons to flight and orders the duke's soul to return to its body. The physician is released and made the first abbot of a splendid monastery erected by the duke and dedicated to the saint. This story is made up of various incidents, one of which, the dispute of demons and angels over a soul, has already been mentioned. The story in its entirety is found, to my knowledge, only in Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 619. The MS Additional 18364 is of the fourteenth century and most of the *exempla* in it are taken from the *Vitae patrum*, Gregory's *Dialogues*, Etienne de Bourbon, and Caesarius of Heisterbach.

No. 76, "De milite, cui Alexander papa annulum donavit." The sight of the ring causes the owner to think of death and future retribution. This is one of the stories in which the source is mentioned, "Legitur exemplum in libro de dono timoris." The story is in Etienne de Bourbon, p. 68. See also Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, IV, 151, and Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 99 (*Liber de dono timoris*), 435 (cited as from E. de Bourbon), 617.

Nos. 78, 79, "De Silvestro papa, qui draconem ligavit." See *Legenda aurea*, p. 78.

No. 84, "De Liberio imperatore, qui thesaurum invenit." Liberius while passing through a certain palace saw in the pavement a marble slab in which was sculptured a cross. He had it taken up, saying that the symbol which should be on men's breasts and brows ought not to be trodden under foot. Another slab with a cross was underneath and a third, which, when removed, disclosed a great treasure. This story is in the *Scala celi*, f. 69, with the ascription "refert Gregorius quod Justinus," etc.

No. 88, "De archidiacono, qui episcopum suum necare fecit." A similar story is in Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 97 (*Liber de dono timoris*), 431 (*Alphabetum narrationum*), 564, 607. Herbert cites Hauréau, *Notices et extraits*, III, p. 242. A variant of this story is in the *Scala celi*, f. 8 vo.

No. 89, "De puero, qui aquam in fonte iussit ascendere." See Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 464, from Migne, *Vitae patrum*, 73, cols. 756, 1004.

No. 91, "De adultero quondam et uxore eius devota." See Ward, *Cat.*, II, 682 (*Promptuarium exemplorum: De Miraculis B.V.*, cap. xxii).

No. 95, "De domicella, quae somniabatur quod e clauastro aufugisset." See Ward, *Cat.*, II, 666; MS Egerton 1117, printed from this in Wright's *Latin Stories*, Percy Society, London, 1843, No. 107.

No. 96, "De filiis, qui cadaver patris sagittis penetraverunt." This favorite story of the true son who would not shoot at his father's corpse is one of the *Gesta Romanorum* tales, No. 45. To Oesterley's references may be added Etienne de Bourbon, No. 160, p. 136. See also Clouston's *Popular Tales*, I, 14, cited by Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 206. The story was a favorite one in the *exempla*-books; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 176, 206, 444, 529, 563, 608, 652, 684.

No. 99, "De domina, quae leproso adhaesit." See Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 655.

No. 103, "De monacho, qui capram dilexit." This famous story was used by Boccaccio in the *Decameron* (Introduction to IVth Day) and is studied by D'Ancona in *Studj di critica e storia letteraria*, Bologna, 1880, p. 307. Many additional references might be given; see Jacques de Vitry, No. 82, and, for *exempla*, Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 8 (*Jacques de Vitry*), 65 (Odo of Cheriton), 504, 573, 607.

No. 104, "De rustico, qui odorem apothecae ferre non potuit." See Jacques de Vitry, No. 131, and Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 64 (Odo of Cheriton), 183, 404 (*Speculum laicorum*), 499, 554.

No. 108, "De rustico et asino." A rustic was leading a loaded ass which stuck in the mud. A soldier passing by alighted from his horse to help the rustic extricate his ass. As soon as the rustic saw what the soldier was doing he made no effort himself and the soldier left him in anger. This is of course a variant of the well-known fable "Le chartier embourbé" (*La Fontaine*, VI, 18; Babrius, 20; Avianus, 32, "Rusticus et Hercules").

No. 109, "De lignis silvarum, quae regem eligere voluerunt." This is the well-known fable from the Book of Judges, 9:8-15. It is used as an *exemplum* by Odo of Cheriton; see Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 34, 38, 42, 43, 46.

No. 112, "De asino et catulo." This well-known fable is in *Jacques de Vitry*, No. 15, and *Gesta Romanorum*, 79, etc.

No. 113, "Lupus monachus." See Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 61 (Odo of Cheriton), 183.

The above are, I believe, all the *exempla* for which Klapper has given no references whatever, and for which I have found analogues. There are also many interesting ones for which Klapper's references are very inadequate. I may mention the following ones:

No. 23, "De triginta missis beati Theoduli." This most interesting and dramatic story of the thirty consecutive masses said to release a soul imprisoned in a block of ice is found in the *Legenda aurea*, p. 731, "De commemoratione animarum." It was a favorite story in *exempla*-books as may be seen from Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 330 (*English Metrical Homilies*), 383 (*Speculum laicorum*), 474, 630, 685. Herbert also cites the version in Hervieux, *Fabulistes Latins*, IV (1896), 254 (Odo of Cheriton).

No. 60, "De nigromante Magdeburgensi." Three youths reduced to beggary by dissipation are conducted by a necromancer to a conventicle of demons. They are given a week to decide whether they will renounce Christ and his mother. While the meeting is going on the king of it arises, takes off his crown, and performs an act of adoration. A little later he rises and bows but does not adore. He is asked to explain his actions and says that the parish priest was passing with the Host to visit a sick man, and the king had to adore it. When the priest returned without the Host the king had to bow in reverence to the office. The references in Klapper to Cantipratanus and Hollen are not pertinent. In their stories the Host breaks up a conventicle of demons, but the two acts of adoration and reverence are wanting. This story also is a favorite one; see Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 407, for the version in one of the MSS (Additional 17723) of the *Speculum laicorum*. To Herbert's references may be added *Scala celi*, f. 64 vo. Other versions are in Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 447, 505, 545, 644, 675, 719.

No. 94, "Deus plus potest quam imperator," the story of the two blind beggars who cried daily through the streets of Rome, "Bene est adiutus, quem deus vult iuuare," and "Bene est adiutus, quem imperator vult iuuare." The emperor has a pastry made and

filled with gold and gives it to the second beggar. He sells it to the first beggar for three pence. When the emperor learns this he confirms the sentence of the first beggar that it is better to trust in God than in man. Klapper cites *Ruodlieb*, vss. 390 ff., in Grimm and Schmeller's *Lateinische Gedichte des X. und XI. Jahrhunderts*. A version is in the "Convertimini" ascribed to Holkot by Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 130. Another is in Wright, *Latin Stories*, Percy Society, 1843, No. 104, Wright cites Gower, *Conf. Am.* vss. 2391-2430. The theme of one of two persons being lucky and receiving the gifts designed for the other is found in *Gesta Romanorum*, No. 109. See also Herbert, *Cat.*, p. 377 (*Speculum laicorum*, "Miser of Winchelsea"), 447 (*Alphabetum narrationum*), 507, 719.

No. 97, "De duobus sociis, qui thesaurum invenerunt." This is the story of Chaucer's *Pardoner's Tale*, and does not occur frequently in *exempla*. I do not remember to have seen it until the publication of Herbert's *Catalogue*, where three versions of it are to be found, pp. 660, 693, 711. Klapper gives a second version in No. 98, "De tribus sociis, qui thesaurum invenerunt." In addition to the references in the Chaucer Society's *Originals and Analogues*, see Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes*, VIII, 100-101, No. 73, "Jésus et les trois voleurs." To Chauvin's references may be added: H. S. Canby in *Modern Philology*, II, 471-87; W. M. Hart in same periodical, IX, 17-22; and Köppel in *Anglia*, XIII, 174-86; XIV, 227-67.

No. 105, "De duobus malefactoribus, qui impetraverunt, ut instrumenta mortis sibi ipsi eligerent," the well-known story of the malefactors condemned, one to be blinded, the other to be hanged, given their choice of the instruments of their punishment. Of course one cannot find a suitable nail or the other a fitting tree. This jest is as old as *Jacques de Vitry*, No. 62, where references to other versions may be found. To these may be added Herbert, *Cat.*, pp. 69 (*Odo of Cheriton*), 461, 552, 573, 602.

There are certain stories to which Klapper gives no references and for which I have been unable to find any parallels. I mention them here in order that someone may be more fortunate in discovering their sources or analogues. Two of this class are of a quasi-historical character: No. 11, "Quomodo Regulus Consul serpentem

vicerit," how Regulus killed a great serpent while waging war against the Carthaginians; and No. 13, "Quomodo Virgilius vanitatem mundi cognoverit," the poet's recognition of the vanity of the world, expressed in the lines:

Pastor, arator, eques, paui, seui, superau.
De capris pastis, rure sato, hoste subacto,
Nec lac nec segetes nec spolia ulla tuli.¹

The others are:

No. 15, "De Hemmerlino, quem s. Thomas Cantuariensis a purgatorio liberavit." A certain knight went with the king of "Suecie" to war with the king of Spain. The knight's horse is killed under him and his faithful servant Hemerlinus gives his own to his master and is himself slain. Three years later the knight on his way to Canterbury has a vision of his former servant tormented in purgatory, from which, he says, he can be liberated by the virtue of St. Thomas, then living. The mass is begun, and the knight sees the church filled with the souls which have been freed from purgatory by the saint. When the mass is finished the whole church is resplendent and the bishop, St. Thomas, sees Michael and a multitude of angels bearing a soul brighter than the sun, which the archangel presented to the bishop with the words: "The Lord offers this soul to thee because thou didst pray devoutly for it." I cannot find this story in the miracles of St. Thomas.

No. 21, "De damnato, quem aquila dilacerabat." We read in the book called *Annulus*, part II, cap. cxix, that there were two noble canons related to each other and both living a life of worldly pleasure. One dies and appears to the other tortured by a black eagle vomiting fire from its mouth and eyes. The dead man warns his kinsman to amend his life and is finally carried off by the eagle.

No. 33, "De divite, qui animas absolvit post prandium." In the same book, *Annulus*, cap. cxxii, we read of a devout man of wealth who invited the poor to a banquet. Among them were three strangers who did not eat or drink. When grace was said, "Fidelium anime requiescant in pace," the three arose and said they were

¹Professor Hamilton has reminded me that the story of Regulus and the serpent is in *Gesta Romanorum*, 268, and the Vergil verses are in the *Anthologia Latina*, Leipzig, 1906, No. 800 (olim 872). The omitted line is:

Capras, rus, hostes, frondo, ligone, manu.

waiting for the only food they used, namely, absolution, whereupon they vanished.

No. 35, "De sanctimoniali, quae animas vidit in ecclesia." In the same book, cap. cxii, we read of a certain nun of the preaching order in Cronwitez, "custos ecclesie," who saw, when she entered the church to ring for matins, a multitude of poor with bags and wallets. She asked who they were and was told that they were the souls of the dead come to bear away the prayers uttered in the church so that they might be freed from their torments.

No. 39, "De duce, quem animae contra inimicos defenderunt." In the same book and chapter we read of a pious duke who built churches and had masses said for the dead. The devil stirred up his subjects to war against him, but he was defended by an army of souls which he had freed from purgatory.

No. 40, "De episcopo, qui vidit iuuenem piscare mulierem." A certain bishop who lived near a cemetery saw in a dream a youth fishing with a golden hook and silver line and catching a woman. When he awoke he looked into the cemetery and saw a youth praying at a certain grave. When asked what he was doing he answered: "I am praying paternoster and miserere for my mother's soul." The bishop then understood that the soul of the mother was delivered from purgatory by the prayers of the youth, and said: "Paternoster est hamus aureus et Miserere est linea argentea."

No. 49, "De visione, quam frater ordinis praedicatorum habuit in hora mortis." An English monk of the preaching order has a vision on his deathbed of Saint Edmund, the Virgin, and angels. Such visions are common, but I have not encountered one exactly like this.

No. 59, "De bufone, qui male acquisita consumabat." In the book called *Annulus*, cap. cxiii, we read that a saint came to an inn where wine was sold by unjust measure, and yet the innkeeper grew constantly poorer. The saint directed the innkeeper to dig near the *clepsedra*, where a great toad was found receiving in its open mouth drops and foam. The saint said to the innkeeper: "Now I know how your ill-acquired goods are consumed."

No. 63, "De clerico, cui daemon promisit, quod foret rex Angliae." A certain clerk is promised the kingdom but is hanged instead.

No. 67, "De clerico, qui verba Scripturarum in epistola amatoria scripsit." In Germany a certain clerk wrote love-letters to a nun and used the words of Scripture: "Labia tua mel et lac" (Song of Solomon, 4:11), in one of them. His tongue protruded and he died suddenly.

No. 68, "De Sarraceno, qui post conversionem suam regem paganorum baptizavit." A certain preacher crosses the sea and converts a Saracen of high rank, who is sent by his lord to convert the heathen. He comes to an island and has a dispute with the king's philosophers, and as a sign of his truth, he invokes a demon who kills the most prominent of the philosophers. The terrified king demands another sign, and the Saracen expounds to him at length a wonderful dream which he has had and which is merely an allegory of Christ's life and death. The king is, of course, converted and baptized, with all his city.

No. 70, "De episcopo Misnensi, qui per sanctam Barbaram a morte liberatus est." The bishop, whose name is not given, was attacked by his enemies in the castle of Stolpan in 1383, but aroused from his sleep and miraculously preserved by Saint Barbara.

No. 80, "De flore, qui in nocte nativitatis Christi floret." St. Helena took to Rome with her some of the hay on which Christ was born and Pope Liberius carefully preserved it wrapped up in the Savior's swaddling-clothes. In Saxony, not far from the city of Dudirstat, in a certain convent was preserved a flower from this hay, which every year on Christmas Eve at the very hour when Christ was born flowered and opened most beautifully and joyfully.

No. 81, "De Judaeo, qui prophetiam invenit in Tholeto." In the time of King Ferdinand a Jew breaking a rock in order to enlarge his vineyard found in a cavity a book with leaves of wood, about as large as a psalter and written in three languages, viz., Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. It spoke of three world-epochs, from Adam to Christ. The beginning of the third is placed in Christ, thus: In the third the Son of God shall be born of the Virgin Mary and shall suffer for the salvation of the world. The Jew was straightway converted and baptized with his household. It was also written in the book that it should be discovered in the time of Ferdinand.

No. 82, "Visio mirabilis in clauastro grisei ordinis Tripolis anno

1277." A certain monk was saying mass before his abbot, and between ablution and communion there appeared a hand writing on the corporal on the altar. The writing contained various prophecies of the vicissitudes of the church and world, of which one is: "Gens quedam veniet, que vocatur sine capite." This is later explained: "Anno domini MCCCXLIX, quando isti flagellatores fuerunt, qui fuerunt gens sine capite."

No. 83, "De solatiis Lucensibus." In the city of Lucca, "civitate Lucana," the inhabitants amused themselves by creating a pope, an emperor, a king of France, and a Lord of Lucca who was over all the others and summoned them to appear before him and to show him honor and reverence. After this the Lord of Lucca asked: "Is there a greater lord on earth than these?" and the answer was: "Christ." "Where is he?" "In the churches." Then they led before the Lord of Lucca a priest arrayed for the mass and he did honor to him. "In that very year the city was divided and fell from bad to worse and in a short time was sold more than five times." I do not know any analogue for this curious anecdote.

No. 92, "De ribaldo, quem mulier in puteum misit." A certain woman had an unworthy husband, who spent his substance in riotous living and depended on a prophecy that he should find a treasure. The wretched wife consulted the priest who advised her to follow this stratagem. She told her husband that it had been revealed to her that the treasure in question was in the well, but that she could not seek it. So she lowered him into the well, and when he was half-way down, she let go the rope, and he fell and broke his arms and legs and had to stay at home with his wife.

No. 107, "Quomodo miles novus armaretur." We read in ancient histories that when a new knight of noble degree is to be armed and enter battle or the lists, the most beautiful maiden who can be found, the daughter of a king, for instance, leads him into her chamber, arms him, and then embraces him and promises him her love if he returns victorious. Thus she encourages him to do well and fight manfully.

No. 110, "De urso, qui mel gustare voluit." The bear was so recalcitrant that he had to be dragged to the honey and his ears remained in the hands of the one dragging him. When, however, he had tasted the honey, he had to be dragged away by his tail, and

that too remained in the hands of the one dragging him. So the bear lost his ears and tail on account of the sweetness of the honey, and thus it is that all other bears are now born as they are, who, according to this fable, were formerly born in another fashion.

No. 114, "De lupo, qui ieiunavit." A wolf seeing Christians fast, fasted himself forty days. When Easter came no one gave him any food. Then he saw a sheep on a disciple's shoulder and tried to reach it but was struck by a scythe and wounded. Then he sought a goose which was said to possess the art of healing. The goose was frightened and kept wounding the wolf anew with its hard beak. At last the wolf saw the craft of the goose and pretended to have quinsy and persuaded the goose to put its beak in his throat and swallowed the unhappy fowl, only to die afterward of his own wounds.

No. 115, "De asino, qui voluit scire ovi cornicis dispositionem." A loaded ass was passing a church and heard the priest declare that the state of men and beasts was similar to that of the crow's egg. The ass threw off his load and tried to climb a tree in order to see what the condition of the crow's egg really was. He got a fellow-ass to help him up and saw that the eggs were white. "Oh," he exclaimed, "am I so fair? I will not carry any more loads, but how shall I descend?" The crow happened along and said: "If you will promise not to climb up again, I will carry you down." The ass that he was, trusted to the crow and fell heavily down. Then he exclaimed: "I will not climb a tree again, but will remain an ass as I was before," and so he again resumed his burden.

As will be seen from the above résumé the collection made by Klapper is an interesting one and contains some important analogues. The editing is, however, as I have shown above, very inadequate. The student of this class of literature will see from my references how indispensable to all workers in this field is the *Catalogue* of Mr. J. A. Herbert, recently discussed in these pages.

T. F. CRANE

ITHACA, N.Y.
December 27, 1912

NOTE.—My colleague, Professor G. L. Hamilton, has called my attention to the following corrections and additions: No. 30, see G. L. Hamilton on death of Herodias in *Romania*, XLI, 278 ff. No. 39, cf. Grimm, *Deutsche*

Sagen, No. 328. No. 47, The *Vita S. Brandani* known to the writer was probably not the *Navigatio* printed by Jubinal, but the fuller text presented in the *Vita* printed by C. Plummer, *Vitae sanctorum Hiberniae*, the source of the Anglo-Norman version published by Suchier and Michel (cf. Plummer, *Zeitschrift für celt. Philol.*, V, 138; *op. cit.*, I, xlii). In this version (Plummer, *op. cit.*, II, 286-87, chaps. xii, xiv, Anglo-Norman trans. ed. Suchier, 1300 ff., 1355 ff., *Romanische Studien*, I, 581, 582), Judas relates in detail how he rests "die dominica," and then goes through various punishments, beginning "in die lune," details of which there is no sign in the other versions. No. 66, for further analogues see A. Schönbach in *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 163, I, 35, for name of demon see *Studien zur vergl. Literaturgesch.*, VI, 279. No. 74, for the first part of the the Jonah-story see R. Köhler in *Lais de Marie de France*, ed. Warneke, pp. c ff.; *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Soc.*, 1910, 273; *Proceedings of the Amer. Philos. Soc.*, 1887, 145; A. Henry, *Travels*, 1909, 107. In some of the instances cited emphasis is laid on the fact that the victim was tied helpless to a plank, as in this example, a substitution of the earlier custom of throwing in the victim after cutting off his limbs. For the second part add R. K. Klein, *Schriften*, I, 117; von der Leyen in *Archiv für das Studium der neuer. Sprachen*, CXVII, 84; I. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, II, 340; *Jahrbuch für rom. und eng. Lit.*, IV, 110. No. 80, The flower of Dudirstat which blooms on Christmas Eve is paralleled by the well-known Glastonbury thorn and similar marvels elsewhere; see Brand, *Pop. Ant.*, ed. Ellis, II, 293 ff.; III, 375 ff.; *Folk-Lore*, V, 337; XXI, 225; XXII, 323; *Joseph of Arimathea*, ed. Skeat, xxii; *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, 1907, 103; Trevelyan, *Folklore and Folk Tales of Wales*, 106; *Jahrbuch für rom. und eng. Lit.*, III, 230. No. 97, There is another Latin version not yet noted in the sermon of the Spanish preacher in *Revista de archivos*, ser. III, Vol. VII, pp. 420-21; an unnoted version is also in Renal, *Contes de Madegascas*, II, 21-22.

POPE IN GERMANY IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

There is still a wide difference of opinion in regard to the influence which Pope exerted upon German literature in the eighteenth century. Hettner, for example, seeks to minimize this influence, and holds that only the weaknesses of Pope, not his excellences, had passed over to his German imitators.¹ It is also widely assumed that Pope had nothing that appealed to the new literary taste developed during the latter part of the century, that amid the enthusiasm which writers like Shakespeare aroused, Pope was completely forgotten. This is the opinion of one of his recent critics who says: "In Deutschland nahm das Interesse für Pope ganz und gar ab, als das strahlende Gestirn eines Shakespeare zu leuchten anfang." ² There are those, on the other hand, who regard Pope's influence as much more vital and lasting. Max Koch,³ quite contrary to Hettner, thinks that Pope's most important characteristic, his style, did much toward the development of the German poetic language and that some of the greatest literary men of the eighteenth century, such as Lessing, Wieland, and Schiller, learned important lessons from him.

Extensive proof for any of these more or less contradictory opinions in regard to Pope is still lacking. The critical studies dealing with the subject are few and limit themselves to special phases.⁴ I am offering here, therefore, the first part of a somewhat detailed investigation covering the entire question. It is my purpose (1) to show the extent to which Pope was read by the Germans of the

¹ "Gesch. d. d. Lit. im 18. Jahrh.," 4. Aufl., I, 306.

² Karl Graner, "Die Übersetzungen von Papes Essay on Criticism und ihr Verhältnis zum Original" (Aschaffenburg, 1910), p. 3.

³ "Ueber die Beziehungen der Eng. Lit. zur Deutschen im 18. Jahrh." (Leipzig, 1883), pp. 12 ff.

⁴ In addition to the work of Graner already cited, should be mentioned: Erich Petzet, *Die deutschen Nachahmungen des Papeschen Lockenraubes*, "Zs. vergl. Litg.," Neue Folge, Bd. IV (1891), pp. 409 ff.; R. Maak, "Ueber Papes Einfluss auf die Idylle und das Lehrgedicht in Deutschland" (Graz, 1895); A. Frick, "Ueber Papes Einfluss auf Hagedorn," *Progr.* (Wien, 1900). A brief sketch of Pope's influence in Germany is found in Albrecht Deetz, "Alexander Pope. Ein Beitrag zur Litg. des 18. Jahrh., nebst Proben Papescher Dichtungen" (Leipzig, 1876).

eighteenth century, (2) to give an account of their critical attitude toward him, (3) to trace the influences which he had upon their literature.

GERMAN TRANSLATIONS OF POPE

The present study will limit itself chiefly to the first of the points outlined, an examination of the various translations of Pope's works during the eighteenth century and a statement of the conditions under which they originated.

To the German translator, Pope offered many difficulties. Although such well-known poets as Brockes, Hagedorn, Eschenburg, and Bürger are counted among his translators, the work of none of them received the distinction that was accorded Ebert's translation of Young for example, a work which so far excelled its competitors as to discourage further attempts.

It is undoubtedly no mere accident that Ebert, who enjoyed in his time the reputation of being the greatest German translator from the English, avoided Pope. His experience as a translator and his excellent knowledge of both languages showed him at once the almost insurmountable difficulties which he who would translate Pope adequately would meet. While the sonorous and loosely joined lines of Young may be satisfactorily rendered in equally sonorous prose, that is not the case with the terse, highly polished and sententious couplets of Pope. Pope without his style is no longer Pope, and any translator that leaves this out of consideration gives his readers no adequate conception of his author.

It is, I think, generally agreed that a translation which disregards Pope's meter misses one of the chief characteristics of his style. There is no other metrical form which is so well suited to express his pointed antitheses as the heroic couplet. But this metrical form was new to the Germans of the eighteenth century and presented difficulties due to essential differences in the two languages. The German language has a much greater tendency to compound words and is much more highly inflected than the English. As a natural consequence, the same idea can generally be expressed in fewer syllables in English than in German, and if we add to this natural terseness of the English language the unusual compactness of Pope's style, the difficulty of confining Pope's antithesis to the couplet is at once

apparent. In addition to this, Pope's thoughts, often commonplace though very pleasing in the polished setting which he gives them, are likely to appear flat in the idiom of another language.

But the German translator was at another great disadvantage. The English language had attained a very high degree of development a century before Pope began to write, while the German language, well on into the second half of the eighteenth century, was still crude and unwieldy. The change which the latter underwent between 1740 and the advent of Goethe and Schiller is truly remarkable. It will be seen that the numerous translations and imitations of Pope did much toward bringing about this change. The conciseness and highly finished language of Pope was a topic ever upon the lips of the German critic, so that many a German writer, to acquire these much desired characteristics of style, schooled himself in the poetry of Pope. We will now see with what success the translators of Pope coped with these difficulties.

1. *Pope First Entered Germany Through France*

It is entirely natural that France should be the most important early medium through which the fame of Pope was extended to other European countries. Pope had learned much from France. His literary doctrines were in a large measure those of French pseudo-classicism represented by Boileau. The work of Pope was received, therefore, in France with immediate and almost universal favor, while the works of Shakespeare and Milton were regarded as barbarous. Among the noted French critics it was particularly Voltaire who by his lavish praise did much toward directing the attention of Europe to Pope.¹

The Germans on the other hand, with Gottsched as the chief exponent of French literary theories, had learned to accept without question the critical opinions of France. It was, therefore, largely through French translations and through the numerous reviews and criticisms which during the third and fourth decades of the century circulated in such journals as the "*Mémoires de Travaux*," the "*Journal des Scavans*" and the "*Nouvelle Bibliothèque*" that Germany made its first acquaintance with Pope. German criticism of Pope

¹ Cf. Archibald Ballantyne, "*Voltaire's Visit to England (1726-29)*," (London, 1893), pp. 72 and 86.

during this period confined itself in a large measure to translations from these journals or to reviews of French translations.¹

On account of the position of authority in matters social, political, and literary, which France had acquired in Germany as well as on the continent generally, the French language had become the second mother-tongue among the Germans. English, on the other hand, was a language little known in Germany until the rapidly growing interest in English literature made its acquirement among the cultured a necessity. With the general interest in Pope aroused, it then became a question of either reading him in the French or translating him from French translations into German. It was by the latter method that the first German translation of Pope, that of "The Rape of the Lock," appeared in 1739 in prose by an unknown translator.²

By the title of the work the author conveys the impression that he had made the translation directly from the English, and in the introduction he says nothing to the contrary. But there is every evidence that he had nothing before him except the French prose translation of 1728.³ A comparison of the two works makes this at once apparent. The Frenchman prides himself in his introduction on his faithfulness to the English⁴ but takes great liberties with his text. Whole lines are omitted, other ideas added, and the sense of the English is often badly distorted. In all of these deviations the German follows his French model religiously. His meager introduction also contains nothing not found in the introduction of the French work.

Two years later was published a translation of the "Essay on Man" under similar circumstances.⁵ According to the introduction it is the work of the leisure hours of a busy public official who lays

¹ Cf., e.g., the early criticisms of Pope in "Neue Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen," Leipzig; and the "Frankfurter gelehrte Zeitungen."

² "Der merkwürdige Haar-Locken-Raub des Herrn Pope, aus dem Englischen ins Deutsche übersetzt" (Dresden), 1739.

³ "La Boucle de Cheveux enlevée, poème héroïcomique de M. Pope. Traduit de l'Anglois, par M.L.D.F. À Paris, 1728."

⁴ "La traduction," he says, "est très littérale. On n'a rien ajouté, ni rien retouché et si elle renferme quelque différences, elle sont légères et dans les règles" (p. 11).

⁵ "Des Ritters Alexander Pope Versuch an dem Menschen, in vier Sitten-Briefen an Henrich St. Jean, Grafen von Bolingbroke über die Natur und den Zustand des Menschen. Zuerst aus dem Englischen in das Französische, durch den Hn. Abt. Du Resnel, und nunmehr in das Teutsche übersetzt. Nebst einigen andern Uebersetzungen. Frankfurt am Mayn, bey Frantz Varrentrapp, 1741."

no claim to scholarship. He says that he may not always have written in the pure Saxon dialect and his datives and ablatives may not always be correct, but that his chief aim was to reproduce the beauty of the thought rather than that of the language. He claims no knowledge of English, giving as his only source Du Resnel's French translation.¹

This work of Du Resnel, to which was added a translation of the "Essay on Criticism," owing to the smoothness of its verse, was undoubtedly the most widely read translation on the continent during the two decades following its appearance. It was only after a wider acquaintance with the original and after the weakness of Crousaz' attack upon Pope had become generally known, a weakness which was due to some extent to this French translation which Crousaz had used, that the public became aware of the extreme liberties which Du Resnel had taken with Pope's text. To adapt Pope's two Essays to his French readers Du Resnel felt himself compelled to make many changes. Passages too harsh for the aesthetic French ear were entirely omitted, others were rearranged or expanded, and he occasionally found himself obliged to supply the necessary transitions which he felt were lacking in the original, so that the number of alexandrine lines in his version is more than half as large again as the number of pentameter lines in Pope.

The German translator follows his French model very closely. He not only reproduces the lengthy preface of Du Resnel, but also prints the French text of the "Essay" opposite his own. Like his model, he uses the rhymed alexandrine and limits himself exactly to the number of lines in the French. As a translation of Pope the work was, of course, of little value. The unscientific method of this unknown translator did not, even in that less critical age, pass without its due censure.²

The gross faults of the French translations, particularly of "The Rape of the Lock" of 1728, upon which, as we have seen, the first German translation of that work was based, became the subject of

¹ "Les Principes de la Morale et du Goût, en Deux Poèmes, traduits de l'anglois de M. Pope, par M. Du Resnel, Abbé de Sept-Fountaines, de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. A Paris, 1737."

² Cf., e.g., "Göttinger gel. Anzeigen," 1741, p. 597 f.; and "Freymüthige Nachrichten," Zürich, I (1744), 373.

extensive comment by Frau Gottsched in the introduction to her translation of "The Rape of the Lock," published in 1744,¹ and in the footnotes of her text she gives numerous illustrations of the liberties which the anonymous Frenchman had taken with Pope's work. Six or seven years before, she tells us, she had been induced to begin a translation of Pope's mock-heroic from the above-mentioned French translation and that she had finished four cantos before she finally secured an English edition. "Aber wie erstaunte ich," she exclaims, "und wie sehr reute mich meine Zeit und Mühe, als ich sah, wie weit wir von dieses grossen Dichters Feuer, Scharfsinigkeit, kurzen nachdrücklichen Satiren, und edlen poetischen Beschreibungen entfernt wären." In her chagrin she denounces all French translations as unreliable and advises all who wish to save themselves time and trouble to avoid them. In view of the decided leaning of Gottsched toward French literature, it is somewhat surprising to note the fervor with which she defends her own country against what she regards as the conceited and overrated French, and this at a time when the relative merits of French and English literature were being bitterly contested by Gottsched and his opponents.²

It was some time after the disheartening experience with this French translation that Frau Gottsched took up the work again and translated the final canto from the English. This, she tells us, proved so much easier and so much more successful that she decided to translate the entire work from the English.

When we take into consideration how early the translation was made and the difficulties of the task, we must regard it as a very creditable effort. She was unfortunate in choosing the somewhat heavy alexandrines for the light content of Pope's mock-heroic; but this fault must be ascribed to the fashion of the day rather than

¹ "Herrn Alexander Popen Lockenraub, ein scherzhaftes Heldengedicht. Aus dem Englischen in deutsche Verse übersetzt, von Luise Adelgunde Victorie Gottschedinn. Nebst einem Anhang zweier freyen Uebersetzungen aus dem Französischen. Leipzig, in Bernhard Christoph Breitkopfs Verlag. 1744."

² "Man wundert sich nämlich gar sehr," she says, "dass die Deutschen einmal anfangen, die so lange vergrösserte und von uns blindlings geglaubte Grösse der französischen Verdienste zu untersuchen, und es frey herauszusagen: man fände dass sie auch schwache Menschen sind, und es habe unserm Vaterlande an grossen Männern niemals gefehlet, fehle ihm auch voritzo nicht an solchen, die es mit allen gallischen Sternen erster Grösze gar wohl aufnehmen, und selbige gar verdunkeln können. Das ist nun freylich ein verwegener Eingriff in den bisherigen ruhigen Besitz des französischen Vorzuges vor den Deutschen!"

to any lack in herself of a sense of poetic fitness. Her lines are rhythmic and generally poetic. She attempts to imitate, often successfully, Pope's compressed style without committing the glaring improprieties in language of which so many other translators of Pope were guilty. However, in spite of her effort to follow her text closely, she is sometimes guilty of inaccuracies.¹

The same year in which this work came from the press, a long and scathing criticism of it appeared in the "Züricher Freymüthigen Nachrichten,"² a journal with which Bodmer was closely connected. The reviewer refused to recognize even the slightest merit in the work and used it, apparently, merely as a pretext for an attack upon the hostile party, an excellent illustration of the general character of the criticism during this period of literary readjustment in Germany, where sane and unbiased judgment often gave way to personal vilification.³

In 1772, after the death of Frau Gottsched, a revised edition of the work was published by an unknown editor.⁴ It had been the desire of the translator before her death to correct the numerous mistakes which she acknowledged had crept into her translation, but this she was unable to carry out. It was felt that the work possessed sufficient merit to warrant the contemplated revised edition. The editor accordingly subjected it to a thorough revision in which he sought to avoid most of the features which had been found objectionable.

The French influence shows itself not only in these translations from the French, but also in several German publications of French versions. Here belongs the translation of the "Essay on Man" by Baron de Schleinitz, published in Helmstedt in 1749.⁵ Ostensibly the author's purpose was to produce a verse translation of Pope's

¹ As, e.g., when she translates: "For life predestined to the gnomes embrace" (Canto I, 80) by "Sind schon lebend bösen Gnomen zur Umarmung ausgesetzt" (p. 5); "mystic order" (I, 122) by "verborgne Ordnung" (p. 7); "well-dressed youths" (II, 5) by "goldne Stutzer" (p. 9); and "the finny prey" (II, 26) by "leichtes Fussvolk" (p. 10).

² I, 278 f. and 283 ff.

³ Cf. the much more favorable review in "Zuverlässige Nachrichten," Leipzig, VI (1745), 219-28.

⁴ "Herrn Alexander Popens Lockenraub, ein scherzhaftes Heldengedicht. Aus dem Englischen in deutsche Verse übersetzt, von Luise Adelgunde Victorie Gottschedinn. In dieser Zweyten Auflage durchaus verbessert, und beinahe ganz umgearbeitet. Leipzig, 1772, bey Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf und Sohne."

⁵ "Essai sur l'Homme de Monsieur Pope. A Helmstedt, chez Jean Drimborn, 1749."

Essay that would avoid the serious faults of Du Resnel's work; really, however, it seems to have been to furnish himself with a pretext for an elaborate dedication to the reigning family of Brunswick. After the usual encomiums upon Pope and an acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Brookes, whose translation he regards as the best that had up to that time been produced in any language, he reviews at great length the faults of the popular French version of Du Resnel. Turning now to his translation, we find that he escaped but few of Du Resnel's shortcomings and produced none of his excellencies. We look in vain for Pope's "traits hardis," his "pensées extraordinaires" and "ces expressions singulières qui frappent" which he missed in Du Resnel's rendering. He freely adds ideas of his own and expands Pope's thoughts so that the number of his alexandrine lines is nearly three times the number in the English.¹

One of the earliest translations of "Eloise to Abelard" published in Germany appeared likewise in the French language. It formed part of a collection of translations in French of a number of English authors, published according to the title-page in Berlin in 1751.²

¹ There was also a Latin translation made in Germany a few years before with the following title: "Alexandri Pope, Equitis Anglicani & Poetae incomparabilis Commentatis de Homine Poetica, ex Anglico Idiomate, in Latinum translata & Carmine Heroico expressa, Notisque subiunctis illustrata, per Joh. Joachimum Gottlob Am-Ende, Bonarum Artium Magistrum ac Diaconum Graeffenhayensem." Vitemberg, 1743. That the work appeared the year before is shown by two reviews: "Zuverlässige Nachr.," Leipzig, III (1742), 815-22, and "Staats- u. gel. Ztgn.," Hamburg, 1742, No. 177, November 7. Pope, who was ever on the alert to increase his popularity abroad, had previously to this employed Dobson, who had gained considerable reputation through his translation of Prior's "Solomon," to prepare a Latin verse translation of the Essay. After completing half the work, however, he gave up his task. Pope's further attempt to procure someone who could turn it into Latin prose seemed equally unsuccessful. When, therefore, a copy of this Wittenberg translation was sent to him by the author, Am-Ende, at Hagedorn's suggestion (cf. Friedrich von Hagedorn's "Poetische Werke," hrsg. von Eschenburg, Hamburg, 1800. Fünfter Theil, p. 60, note), he examined it, no doubt, with considerable interest. Pope had considered all foreign translations with which he was acquainted unsatisfactory in that either the sense or the poetry was lost in them. This Latin translation was no exception in this regard, for while he pronounced it a very faithful rendering, he thought it inelegant. (Cf. "The Works of Alexander Pope," edited by Elwin, London, 1871, II, 267, note.)

² *Mélange de différentes Pièces de Vers et de Prose traduites de l'Anglois, d'après Mmes Elize Haywood et Suzanne Centlivre. Mrs. Pope, Southern et autres. A Berlin, 1751.* 3 vols. "Héloïse à Aballard," Vol. 2, pp. 1-41. (Cf. "Lessings Schriften," Lachmann-Muncker Ausg., IV, 261.)

A collection of Pope's Works in French with Amsterdam and Leipzig upon the title-page seems to have had extensive circulation in Germany. It was published first in two volumes under the title: "Oeuvres diverses de M. Pope. À Amsterdam et à Leipzig, chez Arkstée et Merkus 1749." Vol. I contains Du Resnel's verse translation of the "Essay on Man," and the "Essay on Criticism," and "La Boucle de Cheveux enlevée. Poème Héroïcomique, trad. en vers François par M. . . ." Vol. II contains the same

There is but one other translation to be mentioned which was directly based upon a French text, namely a version in alexandrines of "Eloise to Abelard" published in 1760.¹ The anonymous author places parallel to his text a French rendering which had come from the press the year before.² This French text seems to have been his only guide, for he follows closely its extremely free paraphrase of Pope's work.

After the middle of the century the German language began again to assume a position of respectability as a literary language, so that the demand for French translations of foreign works was no longer felt. A more general knowledge of the English language, as a result of a rapidly growing interest in English literature, made it likewise unnecessary to use the unscientific expedient of translating English works from the French.

2. *Hamburg and the Early Pope Translations*

Of all the cities in Germany, Hamburg was the first to show a prominent interest in English literature. The commercial importance of the city brought her merchants frequently to the English capital, and for the same reason English business men were accustomed to visit the German port. Amid these intimate commercial relations, it could hardly have remained uninformed of the important literary events across the channel, especially since it had comparatively easy access to English publications. Hamburg thus early became the chief distributing point of English literary works in Germany.³ It was here that the English moral weeklies of Addison

works in prose together with the "Moral Epistles." The "Berlinischen wöchentlichen Berichte der merkwürdigsten Begebenheiten des Reichs der Wissenschaften und Künsten" for the year 1749, p. 213, commends the publishers and suggests that the other works of Pope be added to this edition. "Ein so sinnreicher Schriftsteller, als Hr. Pope," the review continues, "verdient von jedermann gelesen zu werden; und es ist besser, dass wir von ihm eine vollständige getreue Uebersetzung haben, als dass aus selbigen einige Brocken abgeborget, und in deutsch gebrochenen Gedichten vorgeleget und vor deutschen Wiz und was neues verkauft werden." This suggestion was carried out; an enlarged edition of the work was published 1754 in 6 vols., another in 1758 in 7 vols. and an 8-vol. edition containing the complete works of Pope in 1767.

¹"Brief der Heloise an den Abelard. Eine freie Uebersetzung aus dem Herrn Pope. Gotha bey Christian Mevius, 1760."

²"Lettre D'Héloise à Abélard. Traduction libre de M. Pope. Par M.C. . . . Au Paraclet, 1759."

³Bodmer, e.g., was indebted to Hagedorn (in Hamburg) for a number of English works. Cf. "Litterarische Pamphlete aus der Schweiz. Nebst Briefen an Bodmern." Zürich, 1781, p. 101.

and Steele were eagerly read almost immediately upon their publication and where their first German imitations appeared. It was in Hamburg, too, where "Robinson Crusoe" made its first appearance in German dress, which started the flood of "Robinsonaden" in Germany that has not yet subsided. Here also Thomson's "Seasons" was first translated and exerted its earliest influence upon German poetry.

It was upon this already much traveled literary route that Pope first entered Germany directly from England through Brockes' translation of the "Essay on Man." Brockes was among the first important literary men of Germany to show a decided interest in English literature. He was one of the leaders in the "Patriotischen Gesellschaft," an interested reader of the English "Spectator" and a contributor to the "Patriot" (1724-27), one of the most important German imitations of the English moral weeklies. His translation appeared in 1740, but he had long before been a close student of Pope whose influence is clearly reflected in the early issues of his "Irdischen Vergnügen in Gott."

Brockes was considered, on account of his fame as a poet and his reputation as a translator,¹ the one best fitted for translating Pope. As early as 1737, in a somewhat extensive review in the "Frankfurter gelehrten Zeitungen"² of several French translations from Pope, the reviewer, after calling attention to the excellent work of the English poet and deploring in contrast to this the degenerate condition of German literature,³ gives a resumé of the "Essay on Man" and continues: "Schöne Lehren einer unbetrüglichen Weltweisheit! würdige Früchten eines wohlgeübten Verstandes. Es wäre zu wünschen, dass eine Feder, die so richtig in der Uebersetzung und so zierlich in ihren Ausdrücken, als des Herrn Brocks seine wäre, dieses schöne Gedicht in Teutscher Sprach heraus geben möchte."

Encouragement of this kind finally persuaded Brockes to undertake the translation, which he completed probably early in 1739. In the "Hamburgischen Berichten von gelehrten Sachen" of this year,⁴ B. J. Zinck, a young scholar and at that time tutor in Brockes'

¹ Especially his translation of Marino's "Strage degl' Innocenti," 1715.

² II, 433 ff.

³ "Bey uns herrscht ein dürrtiger Zwang. Wir denken aus Noth. Wir schreihen aus Armuth und machen grosse Bücher, die niemand liest" (p. 435).

⁴ No. 74, pp. 633-39.

family at Ritzbüttel, published a preliminary announcement of this work of Brockes, stating that the latter had undertaken it both for his own edification and for the benefit of his countrymen, and that it had been completed some time since. This announcement is accompanied by a summary of the excellences of Pope's "Essay" and of its contents.

The work which came from the press early the following year (1740)¹ contains besides the English and German texts of Pope's "Essay" other translations, including several extracts from Thomson and Milton. To these translations of Brockes was added Zinck's translation of Warburton's "Defense" of Pope's "Essay" against the charges of Crousaz, the appearance of which with this first German translation of the "Essay" was especially timely, since Crousaz' attack upon Pope's philosophical system in the "Essay on Man" had been given wide circulation upon the continent.²

Of considerable importance also was the general introduction by Zinck, in which he gave a brief biography of Pope and a somewhat extensive criticism of his works. He regarded Pope as a keen philosopher and one of the most graceful and correct of poets, who had excelled all of his predecessors in the skill with which he had united metaphysics and poetry.

The numerous reviews which followed reiterated in a general way this criticism of Zinck and the majority of them speak favorably of Brockes' translation,³ while a few, like the "Göttinger gelehrten Anzeigen,"⁴ carefully avoid a discussion of its merits in their notices of the work. But even at this early date, the time of Brockes'

¹ The complete title is: "Hrn. B. H. Brockes, Ltl. Com. Pal. Caes. Rathsherrn der Stadt Hamburg, und p. t. Amtmanns zu Ritzbüttel, aus dem Englischen übersetzter Versuch vom Menschen, des Herrn Alexander Pope, Esq., nebst verschiedenen andern Uebersetzungen und einigen Gedichten. Nebst einer Vorrede und einem Anhang von Briefen, worinnen die Einwürfe des Hrn. C. . . . wider den Essay on Man beantwortet werden, aus der History of the Works of the Learned übersetzt von B. J. Zinck. Hamburg, verlegt Christian Harold, 1740."

² This Defense consisted of five letters and was published serially without the author's name in "The History of the Works of the Learned" beginning December, 1738. These were later expanded into six letters and appeared in book form in 1740. The first work of Crousaz against Pope was published in 1737, under the title: "Examen de l'Essay de Monsieur Pope Sur L'Homme. Par Monsieur de Crousaz, Membre des Académies Royales, etc. A Lausanne, chez Marc-Mich. Bousquet & Comp. Et se vent à Amsterdam, chez Pierre Mortier, 1737."

³ See especially, "Staats- und Gelehrte Zeitungen des Hamb. Correspondenten," 1741, No. 112; and "Frankfurtische gelehrte Zeitungen," VI (1741), 385 ff.

⁴ 1740, p. 458.

greatest popularity as a poet, critics were not lacking who were fearless enough to call the attention of the public to some of the weaknesses of this translation.¹

Brockes was unfortunate in choosing the extremely long meter of eight feet, which often led him to make meaningless additions of his own to complete the lines. He frequently lacks clearness and successfully conceals every one of the much admired characteristics of Pope's style. The very fact that this extremely prosy translation was the work of one who, by a large following, was considered the greatest German poet of his day shows us the extreme crudity of the German poetic language of this time.²

Along with Brockes and Zinck, Hagedorn was equally active in Hamburg in furthering this growing interest in English literature. Through his connection with Brockes, Fabricius, Richey, and other promoters of the "Hamburger Patriot," his attention had been early directed toward the English moral philosophers and moral weeklies. His two years' residence in England (1729-31) naturally developed his knowledge and appreciation of English literature and of Pope in particular, who was at this time the most prominent literary figure in England. That the impression which Pope made upon the young poet was deep and lasting is shown by the distinct influence which the former exerted upon Hagedorn's later works.

In the dispute in regard to Pope's orthodoxy precipitated by Crousaz' charges, Pope found his friends in Germany, especially those in Hamburg, among his staunchest defenders. Pope had published in 1738 his "Universal Prayer," in which he attempted to show his doctrine to be based upon free will, not upon fatalism as his critics had concluded from the "Essay on Man." This poem was thus eagerly seized upon by his German supporters in his defense.

¹ "Zuverlässige Nachrichten von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande, Veränderung und Wachsthum der Wissenschaften," Leipzig, II (1741), 197 ff.

² Scarcely had Brockes' translation come from the press when in one of the reviews of this work ("Staats- u. gel. Ztgn.," 1742, No. 112) another similar effort was brought to the notice of the public. With the review was printed a translation of a few pages from the beginning of Epistle I. This "Probe" is a distinct advance over Brockes. The unknown translator uses the rhymed alexandrine resembling Pope's couplets more closely than do Brockes' lines and seeks to limit, after Pope's manner, the thought to the couplet. But in his struggle for rhyme and meter he frequently deviates from the sense of the original. He received, apparently, little encouragement since his complete translation seems never to have been published.

The "Universal Prayer" was accordingly translated by Hagedorn and printed separately in 1742. Of the numerous versions of the poem which appeared in Germany during this century this was the most popular. It found wide circulation both through the numerous editions of Hagedorn's works and through reprints appearing in a number of journals in different parts of Germany.¹ This popularity was well deserved, for in spite of his disregard for the metrical simplicity and occasionally the thought of the original, he succeeded admirably in reproducing the spirit of Pope's poem. The essential changes which Hagedorn made in Pope's text were intended to protect the latter from the charges which had been made against him. The last line of the first stanza of the poem: "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord" was thus rendered by "Gott, dem alle Götter weichen" in order to remove from the line the suspicion of blasphemy which the original might convey. The editor of the "Hamburger Staats- und Gelehrten Zeitungen," in the introduction to his reprint, excuses Hagedorn's change of such "bedenkliche Stellen" as this and thinks that the author himself would never regret these changes. Indeed, he says, Pope, if he read the German version, ought to feel delighted to find a poem of his translated according to the principles of translation which he himself followed.

Altona, but a short distance from Hamburg, shared with the latter this general interest in English literature. It was here that in 1744 was made the first translation of the "Messiah" by Elias Caspar Reichards.² The Iversche Buchhandlung of Altona was particularly active during these early decades of English influence in

¹ A separate print of it in quarto in the city library of Zürich bears the following title: "Allgemeines Gebeth, in einer freyen Uebersetzung aus dem Pope. Hamburg, gedruckt mit Johann Georg Piscators Schriften." With other poems of Hagedorn it appeared first in his "Moralischen Gedichten," Hamburg. 1750, pp. 1 ff., where the date of the translation is given as 1742. In the latter year it was reprinted in a moral weekly of Hamburg, "Der Bewunderer" (Stück 46), evidently without Hagedorn's permission (cf. Stück 53 of the same journal). The following year it was copied in the "Hamburger Staats- u. gel. Ztgn." (St. 60), and in the "Frankfurtischen gel. Zeitungen" (VIII, 189 ff.) In 1754 it appeared again in the "Neuesten Sammlungen vermischter Schriften," Zürich, I, 65-76. To justify his reprint of the poem the editor of the latter work says: "Es verdient . . . dass es weit bekannt sey. Man wird uns also nicht ohne Dank aufnehmen, dasz wir es hier in dieser Sammlung aufbehalten und weiter herum streuen."

² "Elias Caspar Reichards, öffentlicher Lehrers der Beredsamkeit und Dichtkunst an dem Königl. academischen Gymnasio zu Altona, Proben deutscher Gedichte. Nebst einigen Uebersetzungen. Altona" (Preface dated 1744). "Messias. Eine geistliche Ekloge. Nach Anleitung verschiedener Stellen des Propheten Jesaja in Nachahmung des Pollo, eines Virgilianischen Schäfergedichtes, aufgesetzt," pp. 190-99.

Germany in the spreading of this interest in English literature. The journals which came from time to time from its press, as, for example, the "Nordischen Beyträge" and the "Magazin für den Verstand, den Geschmack und das Herz" worked hand in hand with the various Hamburg journals in the extension of the knowledge of English literary works throughout Germany. Some of the journals were still essentially moralizing in tone, after the manner of the moral weekly, and they drew much of their material from English didactic writers. This explains, no doubt, the appearance in the latter magazine of translations of several of Pope's Epistles and the "Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady."¹ The translations are mere literal prose renderings and give the reader no idea of the real Pope.

From the Iversche Buchhandlung came also (1758-64) the first and only German translation of Pope's complete works in the eighteenth century. By 1758 all of the important works of Pope had been translated, but these translations were, for the most part, either inferior or absolutely unreliable. In view of the wide circle of readers which Pope had in Germany, it was thought a highly desirable as well as profitable undertaking to furnish these German readers of Pope a complete and uniform translation. This work was undertaken by Johann Jacob Dusch, Professor of the English and German languages at the Gymnasium of Altona and known among his contemporaries as the author of numerous didactic poems in imitation of Pope, Thomson, and Young. The translation was made in prose and was based upon Warburton's edition of 1752.

The first volume came from the press in 1758 without the name of the translator.² A review of this volume appeared in the "Züricher

¹ "Magazin für den Verstand, den Geschmack und das Herz. In der Commission der Iverschen Buchhandlung." Altona, 1758. Erstes Quartal, "Vom Gebrauch der Reichthümer an Lord Bathurst," p. 65-80; "Von der Eitelkeit im Aufwande an Richard Grafen von Burlington," pp. 129-39; "Elegie zum Andenken eines unglücklichen Frauenzimmers," pp. 172-75. Zweytes Quartal, "Von der Erkenntnis und den Charakteren der Menschen," pp. 193-204.

Shortly before this, a prose translation had been published of Epistles I, II, and IV, and of a letter of Berkeley to Pope dated Oct. 22, 1717, in Göttingen in a collection of moralistic works drawn from the English Moral weeklies, Mrs. Rowe, Pope, and a number of German sources. The collection bears the title: "Meisterstücke moralischer Abhandlungen Englischer und Deutscher Sittenlehrer. Zweyte Auflage. Göttingen, bey Victorinns Bossiegel," 1754-57. 5 Sammlungen in 1 vol. I have been unable to find any trace of the first edition of this work.

² "Herrn Alexander Pope Esq. sämtliche Werke. Mit Wilh. Warburtons Commentar und Anmerkungen aus dessen neuester und bester Ausgabe übersetzt. Altona, bey David Iversen." Erster Band, 1758; zweyter Bd. 1759; dritter Bd., 1761; vierter Bd., 1763; fünfter Bd. 1764.

Frey müthigen Nachrichten" which speaks of it in most favorable terms, regarding it as the beginning of a translation which expressed faithfully the genius and the distinguishing beauties of Pope's immortal works, so that the insects which had so industriously "metamorphosirt" Pope in the past could now tranquilly be forgotten.¹

But this was by no means the prevailing opinion of Dusch's work. In the first issue of the "Berliner Literaturbriefe"² Lessing called attention to its essential weakness, resulting in the bitterest controversy between Dusch and his Hamburg and Altona friends on the one hand and the Berlin critics, Lessing, Mendelssohn, and Nicolai on the other. Lessing, himself a close reader of English literature, saw clearly the pernicious influence which the numerous inferior translations that were being scattered broadcast over Germany exerted upon the very movement which they were intended to foster. In his opinion Dusch belonged to this class of translators. "Was haben sie nicht schon alles übersetzt," he says in the above review, "und was werden sie nicht noch übersetzen! Eben itzt habe ich einen vor mir, der sich an einen englischen Dichter—rathen Sie einmal an welchen!—gemacht hat. O Sie können es doch nicht errathen!—An Pope."

Lessing had for several years been a student of Pope and in his criticism of Dusch's translation he shows us how clearly he comprehended the fundamental character of Pope's poetry. His criticism of Pope, although commonplace today, was far from being so to the Germans of his day. The greatest contribution of Pope lies, in his opinion, in what might be called the mechanics of poetry; his essential aim being to put the most cogent thought into the fewest and most musical words, and rhyme being with him by no means a negligible matter. Pope cannot therefore, he thinks, be reproduced in prose, as Dusch has done, without gross misrepresentation.³

¹ "Frey müthige Nachrichten von neuen Büchern, und anderen zur Gelehrtheit gehörigen Sachen," Zürich, 1759, p. 181.

² Zweyter Brief, Jan. 4, 1759. Cf. Lessings Schriften, *op. cit.*, VIII, 5-7.

³ "Einen Dichter, dessen grosses, ich will nicht sagen grösstes, Verdienst in dem war, was wir das Mechanische der Poesie nennen; dessen ganze Mühe dahin ging, den reichsten, triftigsten Sinn in die wenigsten, wohlklingendsten Worte zu legen; dem der Reim keine Kleinigkeit war—einen solchen Dichter in Prosa zu übersetzen, heisst ihn ärger entstellen, als man den Euklides entstellen würde, wenn man ihn in Verse übersetzte."

In the introduction to the first volume of the translation, Dusch flattered himself upon his perfect understanding of his author and upon his own poetic gift to aid him in reproducing, at least in some measure, the clarity and poetic fire of the original. Lessing, however, convincingly shows the translation to lack the very qualities which Dusch claimed for it. Indeed, he points out how in various places he had absolutely misunderstood his author.

In 1758 Moses Mendelssohn, the friend of Lessing, had begun in the "Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften,"¹ an extensive review of Warton's "Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope,"² which was continued the following year.³ This continuation was prefaced by a scathing review of the first volume of Dusch's translation, in which he repeated in all essentials the previous criticism of Lessing. Like him, he attempted to show the inadequacy of turning Pope into prose and produced an additional list of faulty translations. At the same time he gave, in his review of Warton's "Essay," an application of his theory of translation by turning into German verse numerous citations which Warton had made from Pope.⁴

These reviews of Lessing and Mendelssohn were instantly followed by numerous replies either by Dusch himself or were inspired by him against what he regarded as an unjust criticism by the anonymous Berlin critics.⁵ He insisted upon the fact that Pope could not be translated satisfactorily into German verse, citing as evidence the numerous unreadable verse translations that already existed of the various works of Pope, and in contrast to these the general excellence of Drollinger's prose version of the "Essay on Criticism." The verse translations of Pope which Mendelssohn made in his review he condemns both for their inaccuracy and for their ineffectiveness. Beauty of thought and musical harmony in a foreign

¹ IV (1758), 500-32.

² Vol. I, London, 1756.

³ Pp. 627-69. Cf. "Mendelssohn's gesammelte Schriften," Leipzig, 1844, IV, 388-439.

⁴ It is in this connection that Mendelssohn made his translation of "The Dying Christian to his Soul," which on account of its general excellence was later reprinted (see below, p. 42).

⁵ "Hamburger Staats- und Gelehrte Zeitungen," Vol. 1759, March 24 and June 29; "Magazin für den Verstand, den Geschmack und das Herz," 1759, pp. 378-85. The translation, Vol. II, "An den Leser," pp. 3-10. "Briefe an Freunde und Freundinnen über verschiedene kritische, freundschaftliche, und andere vermischte Materien." [By Dusch], Altona, bey David Iversen, 1759, pp. 209 ff. "Das Dorf. Ein Gedicht von Joh. Jac. Dusch, der sch. Wissensch. Prof., Altona, bey Iversen, 1760." "An den Leser," pp. 5-14.

author he insists cannot both be reproduced with equal fidelity in a translation, hence if one must be neglected at the expense of the other it should be the latter. He is unwilling to concede the incorrectness of certain passages with which his first critic, Lessing, had found fault and makes a foolish attempt to defend his translation of these passages.¹

To the personal invective which characterized most of these replies the Berlin critics paid but little attention. They regarded this as merely a challenge to produce further proof of the carelessness with which he had translated Pope and of his ignorance of the English language. Thus, immediately after the appearance of the second volume of the translation in 1759 appeared a review of it in the "Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften"² which called attention to the numerous errors in the work.³

If these criticisms were naturally ineffective in changing the essential character of the rest of this work, they were at least responsible for the greater care used in the preparation of the later volumes. For Pope these discussions resulted in a direct gain, for they not only called wide attention to him in Germany but they also warned his German readers against this and similar translations which failed to reproduce his distinguishing characteristics.

3. *Translations Growing Out of the Bodmer-Gottsched Controversy*

We have seen the important part which northern Germany played in the dissemination of English literary influence in Germany beginning about the third decade of the eighteenth century. A similar movement was going on at the same time in distant Switzerland which was even more important because more aggressive than this,

¹ E.g., in the following taken from "The Author's Preface": "It is very unreasonable that people should expect us to be scholars, and yet be angry to find us so," he renders "scholars" by "Schüler"; and in the "Discourse on Pastoral Poetry" he translates "Virgil who copies Theocritus" by "Virgil der den Theokrit ausschreibt."

² V, 93-104. Cf. also the further brief discussions of the work by Lessing in "Briefe die neueste Litteratur betreffend," Lessings Schriften, *op. cit.*, VIII, 63 f., and pp. 94 f. Also "Fabeln," Berlin, 1759, Einleitung.

³ Errors like the following occur: "Nor hallowed dirge be muttered o'er thy tomb" (Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady, l. 62) he translates "und kein geheiligter Koth auf dein Grab gestreut ist" (I, 222); "The Wife of Bath" becomes "Die Badefrau" (I, 99); "A Steed that carries double when there's need" (The Happy Life of a Country Parson, l. 324) occurs as "ein Pferd das Doppelbier holet, wenn es nöthig ist" (II, 180); "And best distinguished by black, brown or fair" (Moral Essays, Epistle II, l. 4) is translated by "und schwarz, braun oder schön" (III, 247).

and which, through open conflict with existing ideals and conditions, hastened the process of literary regeneration that was necessary and inevitable. In this contest the Swiss school with Bodmer and Breitinger at its head and others like Drollinger and Haller as well as many in Germany in active sympathy with them, sought their chief defense in English literary precedent. It was Milton around whom the conflict was at first concentrated, but other English writers like Shakespeare, Thomson, and Pope were soon forced to become the innocent participants in the struggle. Although essential differences exist between Milton and Shakespeare on the one hand and Pope on the other, the work of the latter was eagerly quoted by the Swiss in support of their literary theories, for Pope was considered, both in England and France and even by the school of Gottsched, an acknowledged literary authority.

It was for this reason that a translation of Pope's "Essay on Criticism" found a place beside Bodmer's translation of the first book of "Paradise Lost" in the "Sammlung critischer Schriften," published 1741-44 in Zürich and aimed primarily at the doctrines of the Leipzig school.¹ These translations with a few original German productions of high standard were to show the practical application of the theory contained in the critical and polemical articles. They felt it to be a useless waste of time to spend years in developing a literary taste which had already been found and could be acquired in a short time by a close study of the many excellent foreign literary models.²

Karl Friedrich Drollinger (1688-1742), the first translator of the "Essay on Criticism," although a German by birth, through his long residence in Basel came to identify himself closely with the school of

¹ "Sammlung critischer, poetischer, und anderer geistvollen Schriften, zur Verbesserung des Urtheils und des Wizes in den Wercken der Wolredenheit und der Poesie." Zürich, bey Conrad Orell und Comp., 1741-44. The translation of the "Essay on Criticism" appears in Stück I, pp. 49-84 under the title: "Alexander Popen Versuch von den Eigenschaften eines Kunstrichters durch Hrn. Hofrath Drollinger übersetzt."

² "Warum solten wir," says the anonymous critic in the introduction (p. 9), "so viel Jahre zubringen den Geschmack zu suchen, der doch schon gefunden ist? Die Betrachtungen der Schriften der vortreflichen ausländischen Scribenten sowohl der alten als der neuen, wohlüberlegte Anmerkungen darüber, wovon sie selbst schon gründliche Lehrbücher geschrieben haben, lehren uns viele Sachen, auf welche das eigene Erfinden den fertigsten Geist sehr langsam und spät geführt hätte; man kan sich in einem Tage derer Kunst- und Handgriffe bemächtigen, welche den Erfindern viele Jahre Arbeit und Nachsuchen gekostet haben."

Bodmer. He was indeed one of the earliest in Switzerland to interest himself in English literature and to show the benefit of this influence both in the style and content of his own writings. In common with the rest of the Swiss school, he became a sworn enemy to rhyme and translated the "Essay" in prose. Only two brief passages appear in alexandrines,¹ the first of which, where Pope criticizes the "expected rimes," could hardly have been reproduced without this device. The translation is accurate, but the form in which it was cast, its crude language characteristic of that period, and the fact that it first appeared in a work intensely partisan, prevented its becoming as popular as it undoubtedly would have become under more favorable conditions. Nevertheless, the "Essay on Criticism," as the result of this translation, formed the subject of several extensive reviews. Thus one of the Hamburg journals² speaks of it as a work that above all others deserved to be translated into German, and says that the German public should consider itself especially fortunate that Pope's "Essay" had fallen into the hands of one so skilful as to make of it, to a certain degree, a German original. "He who would know," the reviewer continues, "the true character of an honest and sound critic, let him read this work." He then gives the content of it at considerable length. A similar criticism appeared in the "Franckfurtischen gelehrten Zeitungen."³

Drollinger's translation was reprinted in 1753 when Wieland, who was at that time living in Switzerland and closely associated with Bodmer, published a new edition of the "Streitschriften." With slight changes in the text, chiefly in spelling and punctuation, it appeared also in the various editions of Drollinger's poems first published the year after his death by his friend J. J. Spreng, who added to it extensive notes and citations from German and foreign authors.⁴

Unlike Milton and Shakespeare, Pope was studied and admired by both of the two great literary factions. I have referred to the eagerness with which Bodmer and his followers quoted Pope in

¹ Ll. 350-53 and 366-69.

² "Staats- u. gel. Ztgn.," 1741, Nos. 116, 131, 171, and 203.

³ 1741, pp. 431 ff.

⁴ For the complete titles of the several editions of Drollinger's "Gedichte" see Carl Graner, *Die Uebersetzungen von Pope's "Essay on Criticism," op. cit.*, p. 80.

support of their theories. But essentially Pope's poetic doctrines were more nearly in accord with those of Gottsched, since both developed under a strong French influence. Since, therefore, the first translation of the "Essay on Criticism" was published, as we have seen, under conditions which made it impossible for the Leipzig school to accept it, there was need for a second translation which should have the unqualified approval of Gottsched. Such a translation was prepared by G. E. Müller and published with some work of his own in 1745.¹

In the introduction, containing a brief biography of Pope, Müller refers to the latter as "der Horaz der Britten," regarding him as equal to the Latin author in the keenness of his criticism and superior to him as a poet. The biography, he states, had been finished as early as 1737, disclaiming, therefore, all indebtedness to a similar account published with Brockes's translation of the "Essay on Man," while the translation itself, he says, had been begun still earlier, in 1736. He prides himself, therefore, on being the first German translator of the "Essay on Criticism." As to his translation, he promises a line-for-line rendering of the English in which the reader will find both thought and expression faithfully reproduced. Even the external appearance of the work, he thinks, is worthy of the English author and shows the respect due to the immortal memory of the greatest European poet of his time. An examination of his text reveals, however, none of the promised excellencies. His attempt to translate Pope line for line in alexandrines led him into the grossest inaccuracies and obscurities, leaving no trace of Pope's clarity of expression and poetic harmony. Bobertag in his article "Zu Popes Essay on Criticism"² justly remarks that Pope should be thought fortunate never to have read this translation.³

¹ "Versuch über die Critik aus dem Englischen des Herrn Pope. Nebst einem Versuche einer Critik über die deutschen Dichter, auch einer Zugabe einiger, kleineren Schriften, von M. Gottfried Ephraim Müller. Dresden, 1745, bey Georg Conrad. Walther, Königl. Hof-Buchhändler." W. Heinsius, *Allg. Bücher-Lexikon*, cites another edition bearing the same date with Bremen upon the title-page.

² "Englische Studien," III (1880), 79.

³ "Grade seine trefflichste eigenschaft, die klarheit," he continues, "ist in dem deutschen gewande so in ihr gegentheil verkehrt, dass kein mensch namentlich den letzten passus verstehen kann. Man bringt hier gar kein licht heraus, nicht einmal ein dunkles, kurz Müller . . . hat sein vorbild in vielen stellen gar nicht verstanden."

Gottsched favored the work with an extensive criticism,¹ and while he was not particularly lavish in his praise of it, yet he said nothing at which the translator could have taken offense. He complimented him for the conscientiousness with which he had done his work and for using neither the poetic form of the lazy (Bodmer's and Drollinger's prose) nor the too long metrical form where a dwarf often stands between twenty giants (Brookes' translation of the "Essay on Man"). He pointed out an inaccuracy in the translation of the very first couplet, but excused it on the ground that he himself could have expressed it in two lines no better.² Entirely different from Gottsched's lukewarm praise is the review in the Züricher "Freymüthigen Nachrichten"³ where Müller's translation is made the subject of the most stinging sarcasm. Although inspired by bitter party spirit, it was, as we have seen, not entirely unjustified.

Of Pope's famous satire "The Dunciad," there was, apart from his collected works, but a single German translation in the period under discussion. This lack of interest must not be ascribed to any special aversion in Germany to this particular species of literature. Indeed the many attempts at satire which were made in Germany at this time, inferior though they are, prove quite the contrary. The reason is inherent in the very nature of satire. Its numerous subtle local allusions, its covert attack upon the peculiar weaknesses either of special individuals or of parties are what give it life and interest. Remove it either in time or place from the conditions which gave it birth and much of this interest is lost. It is entirely reasonable, therefore, that the German public with its lack of intimate knowledge of English social and literary conditions should manifest but a slight interest in this work of Pope.

The translation of "The Dunciad" was published in Zürich in 1747, the work of Johann Jakob Bodmer, who, for reasons which will appear presently, concealed his identity under the name of J. D.

¹ "Neuer Büchersaal der schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste." Leipzig. I (1745), 252 ff.

² It is interesting to note what Gottsched had to say in regard to Drollinger's translation: "Uns wundert aber, warum er [Müller] von der drollingerischen Uebersetzung dieses critischen Gedichtes nichts gedacht: doch vielleicht hat er sie nicht nennen mögen, weil sie das Unglück gehabt, in einer Sammlung zu erscheinen, die ehrlebende Leute zu kennen, oder zu nennen ein Bedenken tragen."

³ II (1745), 245-48.

Oberek.¹ Bodmer had for years been interested in the satirical works of Swift and Butler, having published the first two books of "Hudibras" in 1739. During his quarrel with Gottsched he was particularly attracted to "The Dunciad" because he saw in the relation depicted there between Pope and his Dunces a singular parallel to the relation between himself and the school of Gottsched. He conceived, moreover, a plan by which Pope's satire might be turned effectively against his own enemies. He gives an explanation of his plan in his introduction in the form of an epistle, "An meine Freunde die Obotriten." The German "Schöpse" he thinks have many things in common with the English Dunces. They are as numerous, they are gifted with the same talents, they have been schooled in the same school with Theobald and Cibber, their works are as long and tedious as those of their English brethren. His first thought was to accompany the translation of Pope's satire with copious notes in which every English Dunce should be made to resign his place in favor of a German. He then proceeds to give a number of illustrations of his method. Thus Pope's lines—

She saw old Pryn in restless Daniel shine,
And Eusden eke out Blackmore's endless line;
She saw slow Philips creep like Tate's poor page,
And all the Mighty Mad in Dennis rage. (Book I, 101-4.)

he gives as follows:

Sie sah den alten Tiz im fleissgen T——r;
Sah K—— B—— Vers noch länger strecken;
Sah Stoppens Blatt mit Weisens langsam kriechen;
Den Unsinn in Person in Krügern rasen.

However, he met with considerable difficulty in carrying out his plan. He could find, he says, in Germany no publisher of Curl's type, who was in the habit of publishing the inferior work of third-rate poets under the name of some great author. Then, too, often two or more names had suggested themselves for the same place. Since he did not wish to deprive a single "Obotriten" of the honor which he could rightly demand, he decided to think the matter over

¹ "Alexander Popens Duncias mit Historischen Noten und einem Schreiben des Uebersetzers an die Obotriten." Zürich, bey Conrad Orell und Comp., 1747.

and get, if possible, suggestions from his friends in Silesia and Saxony.¹ It was evidently Bodmer's intention to carry out his scheme in a later edition of the work, but this was not published, so that his projected German adaptation never appeared.

Bodmer's translation is based on one of the numerous early editions of "The Dunciad" where the work consisted of three books only. In 1742 Pope changed the work considerably and added a fourth book. The few notes which accompany Bodmer's translation were taken from the English edition, but these were by no means sufficient to make the work intelligible to the great majority of his German readers.² The translation itself was far from being as successful as Bodmer's prose version of Milton's "Paradise Lost" of fifteen years before. The reason for this was partly due to Bodmer's personality. The religious epic appealed to him strongly, as shown by his own numerous attempts in that species of literature, while he was attracted to Pope's satire largely through external circumstances. But the more important reason is to be found in the peculiar difficulties which the translator of satire encounters. An intimate knowledge not only of the English language but of English literary history and English manners is absolutely indispensable to the successful translator of "The Dunciad." The language of satire is highly idiomatic and the satirist frequently hides his keenest thrusts beneath some nicely chosen adjective or adverb. It is such subtleties as these that, although felt by the translator, are often hard to reproduce in another language. Against these difficulties Bodmer could not successfully cope. He often omits important adjectives and sometimes entire phrases and adds, occasionally, descriptive words of

¹ That he actually wrote to his friends for such suggestions is shown by his letter to Sulzer, September 12, 1747: "Ich übergebe Ihnen hier eine Anzahl Dunciaden selbige an meine dasigen Freunde zu vertheilen. Ich wolite gerne, wenn man mir dasu mit genugsamen Nachrichten behülflich wäre, den Einfall, in dem Briefe des Uebersetzers an seine Freunde, die Obotriten, gewissermassen weiter treiben; zwar nicht dass ich die Namen der deutschen Schöpse in den Text setzen wollte, sondern nur in die Noten, um dan zugleich die Uebereinstimmung zwischen den deutschen und englischen Stümpfern anzuzeigen."—"Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Gessner. Aus Gleims lit. Nachlasse," von W. Körte. Zürich, 1804, p. 69.

² Gieseke, who himself was much influenced by English literature, regrets this weakness of the work in a letter to Bodmer (November 25, 1747): "Ich bedaure," he says, "dass die Sorge das Werk zu theuer zu machen nicht erlaubt haben wird, so viel Anmerkungen hinzufügen, dass es auch für die in der englischen kritischen Geschichte unerfahrenen Leser verständlich genug geworden wäre."—"Litt. Pamphlete aus der Schweiz, nebst Briefen an Bodmern," Zürich, 1781, p. 117.

his own. He sometimes deviates from his text deliberately to make Pope's lines intelligible to his readers, as when, for example, he translates "solid pudding" (Book I, l. 54) by "vollkommene Schinken," or the lines:

Till genial Jacob, or a warm third day
Call forth each mass, a poem, or a play. (Book I, ll. 57-58.)

by

Bisz ein Geburtstag oder hitzges Fieber
Jedweden Klosz, Lied oder Comödie
Befruchtend in das Reich der Wesen rufen.

His choice of blank verse for the translation was determined, no doubt, by his great interest in Milton and his handling of it is fairly skilful when we consider the fact that this was one of the earliest attempts in the use of this meter in Germany.

4. *Later Translations and the Rationalistic Undercurrent*

It has been said that, owing to the new literary movement during the last half of the eighteenth century which reached its climax in the "Storm and Stress," the interest for Pope in Germany passed away almost completely.¹ This statement requires, as we shall see, important modifications. The highly finished style of Pope had always remained the subject of admiration, and there were many who, like Nicolai, were little affected by the antirationalistic tendencies. Others again, as in the case of Wieland, while accepting some of the new doctrines, retained many of the old. These men in all essentials continued even into the nineteenth century the literary principles which predominated before the "Storm and Stress." It is this rationalistic undercurrent, which runs thus side by side with the new movement, that kept alive the interest in Pope. The most obvious proof of this continued interest is the large number of translations which appeared down to the close of the century.

Of the foreign influences which contributed to the German Aufklärung, that of Pope is by no means to be neglected. Lessing and Mendelssohn, among the chief representatives of the movement, learned much from him in spite of their attempt to prove the weakness of his philosophical system.² Although often illogical and contra-

¹ Above, p. 1.

² In "Pope ein Metaphysiker!" Danzig, 1755. "Lessings Schriften," *op. cit.*, vol. 6, p. 409 ff.

dictory, through the exquisite poetic form of his works he did more than anyone else to popularize the philosophy of the English rationalists on the continent. Many thus became acquainted with the "Essay on Man" without ever having even heard of Shaftesbury or Bolingbroke.

It was essentially as a philosopher that Pope was known in Germany during the early decades of his influence. For this reason many felt that the early verse translations had not reproduced the ideas of Pope with sufficient exactness. A prose translation was therefore published serially from 1745 to 1747 in a prominent literary journal of the time which was supposed to answer this purpose.¹ The anonymous translator, Christlob Mylius, was one of the early German Aufklärer, a cousin of Lessing, and during the last years of his life intimately associated with him. Mylius was deeply interested in English philosophy, literature, and science, and the various journals which he edited in whole or in part between 1743 and 1748, show clearly this English influence.²

In the introduction to his translation Mylius frankly acknowledges his inability to reproduce the work accurately enough in verse to do justice to Pope, and he thinks it better to give "this treasure of beauties and important teachings" in faithful prose than to withhold from his countrymen the benefit of such an "excellent and at the same time such an instructive and edifying poem." The matter-of-fact unadorned prose of Mylius gives, on the whole, a fairly accurate rendering of Pope's ideas, but disregards completely the poetic qualities of the work.

The popularity of Pope in Germany reached its climax during the sixth decade. His philosophical system had, by this time, been widely discussed in Germany, so that the Berlin Academy felt itself justified in announcing as a subject for the prize essay for the year 1755 whether Pope's famous dictum, "Whatever is, is right," was

¹ "Bemühungen zur Beförderung der Critik und des guten Geschmacks," Halle, Stück 13 (1745), p. 387 ff.; St. 14 (1746), p. 541 ff.; St. 15 (1746), p. 594 ff.; and St. 16 (1747), p. 695 ff.

² Thus Lessing, speaking of one of these journals, "Der Freigeist" (Leipzig, 1745), says: "Ich weiss es aus dem Munde des Verfassers, dass er sich nie hingesetzt, ein Blatt von demselben zu machen, ohne vorher einige Stücke aus dem 'Zuschauer' gelesen zu haben." "Lessings Schriften," *op. cit.*, VI, 400. Mylius died in London, on the eve of undertaking a scientific journey to America, the money for which had been subscribed by noted German scientists, with Haller as the leader of the enterprise.

to be accepted or rejected. In this discussion the most famous literary men of the period such as Lessing, Mendelssohn, and Wieland took part. The interest in Pope was further increased by the publication of Warton's "Essay on Pope" (1756) which was reviewed at great length in all of the important German literary journals of the time and which was a few years later translated by Nicolai.¹

Among the different works of Pope which were translated during this decade the "Essay on Man" continued to occupy the chief place.² In spite of the better understanding of Pope's works and the benefit of the experience of previous translators, the majority of these efforts showed little improvement over their predecessors. The first of these was in rhymed alexandrines and appeared in Leipzig in 1756 by an anonymous author.³ His dedicatory verses were written in rhymed pentameter, one of the early attempts to use this meter in Germany. He followed the English very closely, translating almost line for line. While he was occasionally happy in rendering Pope's couplets, fidelity to the original frequently led him into the use of Anglicisms and awkward expressions, and his language becomes at times quite unintelligible. We are constantly aware that it is a translation that we have before us.⁴

The second of these attempts came a year later (1757) from Switzerland by a follower of the school of Bodmer, Symon Grynäus.⁵ He had five years before published a translation of Milton's "Paradise Regained" and minor poems, an effort which clearly showed him

¹ "Sammlung vermischter Schriften," Bd. 6. Berlin, 1763.

² This decade produced the first and, outside of Pope's "sämmliche Werke" by Dusch, the only translation of "January and May" under the following title: "Januarius und Maja. Aus dem Englischen des Herrn Pope übersetzt. Leipzig und Stralsund, 1754." The work is here faithfully reproduced in prose, but it seems to have had but a limited circulation. Cf. Lessing's review of it. "Schriften," *op. cit.*, V, 213.

³ "Philosophisches Lehrgedichte vom Menschen aus dem Englischen des Herrn Alexander Pope übersetzt. Leipzig, in der Lauckischen Buchhandlung, 1756."

⁴ I have, after extensive search, been unable to locate the translation mentioned by Kayser: "Philosophisches Lehrgedicht vom Menschen. Aus dem Englischen von J. G. E. Schmidt; hrsg. von F. G. Freytag. Leipzig, 1756."

⁵ "Vier auserlesene Meisterstücke so vieler Engländer Dichter: als Priors Solomon, Pops Messias, Youngs Jüngster Tag, Glovers Leonidas. Welchen annoch beygefüget sind Pops Versuch von dem Menschen, und desselben Hirtengedichte. Alles, seiner Vortrefflichkeit wegen, aus der Ursprache in deutschen hexametrischen Versen übersetzt. Basel, bey Johan Jacob Schorndorff, 1757."

According to Goedeke (IV, 61) another translation of the "Pastorals" was made by Johann Heinrich Smid under the title: "Weissagungen der Sibyllen, nebst den Hirtenliedern des Virgil und Pope. Aurich, 1762."

to be rather unfamiliar with the English language. Quite in accord with the principles of his school, he assumes that only that translator can render Pope accurately who discards the use of rhyme. Thus the fifth German translation of Pope's "Essay," along with the "Messias" and "Pastorals" appears, according to the fashion of the day, in the severe and awkward garb of Swiss hexameters. It is difficult to imagine two poetic styles more different than the highly polished couplets of Pope and the heavy, lumbering verses of Grynäus. According to Lessing, who reviewed the work in the "Berliner Litteraturbriefen,"¹ there is little in these lines of Grynäus to distinguish them from ordinary prose. It would be difficult, he thinks, to find any in the world more careless, and the language he regards as "wässrig," "matt," and "weitschweifig."²

Between 1757 and 1760 was published a prose translation of a miscellaneous collection from some of the best known English writers. Along with selections from Thomson, Glover, Akenside, Gray and others, were four by Pope, none of which had before appeared in Germany, namely "On Mr. Elijah Fenton," "The Temple of Fame," "Windsor Forest," and "To Mrs. M. B. on Her Birthday."³ The aim of the translators, according to the "Vorbericht," was to contribute something toward encouraging and improving the literary taste of their countrymen through English works. The translators are especially to be commended for the accuracy with which they sought to reproduce their English models.

In view of the repeated unsuccessful attempts at translating Pope into German, by this time it was thought by many to be an impossible task to give an exact, undiluted rendering of Pope's thoughts and at the same time to reproduce the much admired characteristics of Pope's style in elegant, idiomatic German verse.

¹ May 10, 1759. Cf. "Lessings Schriften," *op. cit.*, VIII, 79 ff.

² For other similar criticisms of this work see: "Staats- u. gel. Ztg.," 1759, July 3; also, "Magazin für den Verstand, den Geschmack und das Herz," Altona, 1759. Viertes Quartal, pp. 376 f.

³ "Vermischte Schriften der Engländer. Rostock und Wismar, bey Joh. Andr. Berger and Jacob Boedner." Erste Sammlung, aus dem Thomson, Glover, Congreve, Rochester, und andern, 1757. Zweyte Sammlung, aus dem Congreve, Pope, und Waller, 1758. Dritte Sammlung, aus dem Thomson, Dodsley, Akenside und Gray. 1760. "Grabschrift auf den Herrn Fenton," p. 164; "Der Tempel des Ruhms," pp. 326-49; "Der Forst zu Windsor an den Lord Landsdown," pp. 352-71; "An die Jungfer M.B. zu ihrem Geburtstage," p. 372.

The translations thus far discussed fulfilled fairly well the first but fell far short in attaining the second and more difficult of these requirements.

In 1759 was published a new translation of the "Essay on Man" by Heinrich Christian Kretsch,¹ which attained the distinction of being the most poetic of any that had thus far appeared. Kretsch himself seems to have been a poet of considerable reputation, one of his reviewers² placing him in a class with Haller and in the smoothness and delicacy of his verse even above him. Like several of his predecessors he uses the rhymed alexandrines, which was deemed sufficiently like Pope's verse while it gave the advantage of an extra foot. The English accompanies his translation and he also adds translations of "The Universal Prayer,"³ the "Messiah" and "The Dying Christian to His Soul." Pope finds in Kretsch an enthusiastic admirer and defender. In his dedicatory verses in the heroic couplet he lauds him as the only one who had been able to express the abstruse teachings of philosophy in beautiful verse, and says that in

¹ "Essay on Man. Der Mensch ein philosophisches Gedicht von Alexander Pope. Deutsche Uebersetzung mit der engländischen Urschrift nach der letzten vermehrten Ausgabe. Altenburg, in der Richterischen Buchhandlung, 1759."

² "Hamburgische Nachrichten," II (1759), 477-80.

³ First published in Gottsched's "Neuer Büchersaal der schönen Wissenschaften und freyen Künste," Leipzig, IX (1750), 182-84.

In Germany the deistic tendency of this poem of Pope remained on the whole unaccepted and it was read by many as one of the most sublime expressions of the orthodox faith. In Switzerland, whose literature was still permeated by a strong religious tone, it was especially popular. The circulation of Hagedorn's translation here has already been discussed. Another version in hexameter, along with "The Dying Christian to his Soul," several of Pope's Epitaphs and a list of moral and religious precepts, selected chiefly from the "Essay on Man," appeared in "Auserlesene Poesien aus den meisten und besten Englischen Dichtern. Hierbevor der Frau Rowe Andachts-Uebungen beygefügt, nun aber besonders gedruckt, verbessert und vermehrt. Zürich, bey Heidegger und Compagnie, 1761," pp. 5-21 and p. 128. As stated in this title these poems of Pope appeared in "Gehelligte Andachtsübungen in Betrachtung, Gebet, Lobpreisung und Herzens-Gesprächen von der gottseligen und sinnreichen Frau Rowe auf ihre Ansuchung übersehen und herausgegeben von I. Watts, Th.D., etc. Wie auch einen Anhang poetischer Stücke von Milton, Dryden, Prior, Pope, Watts, Young und anderen." Erfurt 1754. A second edition appeared the same year with Frankfurt and Leipzig upon the title-page, and a revised edition in Bern, 1756. In regard to Lessing's and Weisse's connection with the work see "Lessings Schriften," *op. cit.*, V, 373.

A much better translation in the meter of the original, of which I have found no mention in any bibliographical work, is in a little work entitled: "Zwey kleine Gedichte. Herrn Diacon Lavater in Zürich gewidmet, 1770." The poems are prefaced by a caption of four lines from the "Essay on Man" (Ep. I, 285 ff.); this is followed by "Grab und Ewigkeit," a poem in the meter and general tone of Pope's "Universal Prayer;" then follows "Allgemeines Gebet von Pope. Deo opt. Max. Eine neue Uebersetzung, 1770." The work is to be found in the Stadtbibliothek of Zürich.

spite of the severe conflict that had been and was still being waged for and against him, his work would be read long after the writings of his adversaries were utterly forgotten.

With the exception of Dusch's translation of Pope's works, this work of Kretsch was more widely reviewed than any other translation of Pope during the eighteenth century. The large majority of these reviews are favorable, commending especially the smoothness of the verse and the clearness with which he reproduced the English.¹ One of Gottsched's journals² calls it a translation with which every friend of Pope has reason to be satisfied. The reviewer in the "Hamburgischen Nachrichten" thinks that after Pope has been "translated and criticized to death" Kretsch's rendering makes further translation of these works unnecessary. Not all, however, praised Kretsch's work as unreservedly as this reviewer. Several of the reviews in the Altona and Hamburg journals³ that had clearly been inspired by Dusch regarded Kretsch's attempt, considering his recognized ability as a poet and the unwearied patience and industry which he had expended upon it, as the best evidence of the impossibility of rendering Pope adequately in verse. While it is clear that these criticisms were made not without bias, Kretsch's translation had its shortcomings. To gain clarity and smoothness he was often compelled to expand Pope's lines to twice the length of the original, while occasionally ideas of his own were used to complete the lines. But in spite of this, it remained the most widely read German translation of the "Essay" in the century and found readers in foreign countries as well.

In 1762 was published in Amsterdam a polyglot edition of the "Essay on Man" containing, besides the English, the Latin translation of Am-Ende, the Italian of Castiglioni, Du Resnel's French, Kretsch's German, and the French prose version of Silhouette.⁴

¹ "Götttinger gel. Anzeigen," 1759, pp. 807-8; "Deutsche Bibl. d. sch. Wiss.," IV (1770), 627 f.

² "Das Neueste aus der anmuthigen Gelehrsamkeit," Leipzig, 1759, pp. 705-58.

³ "Freymütige Briefe über die neuesten Werke aus den Wissenschaften in und ausser Deutschland," Hamb. u. Leipz., 1759, pp. 3-11; "Staats- u. gel. Ztgn.," 1759, July 4; "Magazin für den Verstand, den Geschmack und das Herz," Altona, 1759, pp. 371-77.

⁴ "Essai sur l'homme, poëme philosophique par Alexander Pope, en cinq langues, savoir: Anglois, Latin, Italien, François, & Allemand. A Amsterdam, chez Zacharie Chatelain, Libraire, 1762."

These the editor regards as the best translations in these languages, Du Resnel's version being included on account of its graceful verse and Silhouette's because of its faithfulness to the original. The second edition of this work was published at Strassburg in 1772, but without Silhouette's version, and the third edition in 1801 at Parma with the title and a brief introduction in Italian. The purpose of this work was, according to the Strassburg editor, both to furnish a convenient means of learning these languages and to supply at the same time the most necessary knowledge for educating the heart and ornamenting the mind.¹

The years 1762 to 1764 brought forth the first German reprint of Pope's works by Nicolai, a work which supplied a long-felt need.² The numerous translations that had been made of the various works of Pope were at best unsatisfactory. The knowledge of the English language had been rapidly extended in Germany during the last ten years, while the English works printed abroad were expensive and still difficult to acquire. This edition of Nicolai is a close imitation of the 10 volume Warburton pocket edition (London, 1757), and included all the notes and commentaries. It was received with general favor among the readers of Pope in Germany.³ The original intention of the editor was to bring out from time to time reprints of other English authors such as Milton, Addison, Thomson, Shakespeare and Young, a plan which seems never to have been carried out.⁴

It is interesting to note how unreservedly Pope's philosophy, as expounded in the "Essay on Man," was accepted in Germany long after Lessing and Mendelssohn had exposed its weakness. As late

¹ According to Kayser and Helmsius another translation was published in Jena the year as Kretsch's under the following title: "Der Mensch, ein philosophisches dicht. Deutsche Uebersetzung mit der Englischen Urschrift." This, after extensive search, I have been unable to locate, nor have I found it mentioned in any of the important contemporary journals.

² "The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq. Berlin. Printed for Frederick Nicolai, Bookseller." Vols. 1-2, 1762; 3-6, 1763; 7-10, 1764.

³ Cf. "Kritische und Zuverlässige Nachrichten von den neuesten Schriften für Liebhaber der Philosophie und schönen Wissenschaften." Jena u. Leipzig, II (1762), 240 f., and "Altonaischer Gelehrter Mercurius," Altona, I (1763), 48.

⁴ The general plan is stated in the following paragraph from the "Booksellers advertisement" which prefaced the work: "English Literature having found these many years ago, so much lovers in Germany and the adjacent countries, I doubt not, the design I [sic] have form'd to print neat Pocket-éditions of the English Classical Writers, will be very acceptable to the learned world. I thought best to begin my task with the Edition of Mr. Pope's Works, this author being so universally esteemed by all those that have any taste of Poetry or Learning."

as 1772 a learned divine of Halle, Johann Jacob Harder, felt himself called upon to make a new translation of the "Essay," since none of his predecessors had translated it "so that it could be the handbook of a thinking man." In his opinion Pope, of all philosophers, saw most clearly the mainsprings of human action and pointed out in his "Essay on Man" the only rational way to virtue and happiness.

Klotz, the well-known editor of the "Deutschen Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften," stood sponsor for the work and said in his introduction that in spite of an occasional lack of harmony in the lines, it deserved, on account of other qualities, a place beside its competitors. Harder proposed to reproduce in his translation Pope in all his sententious brevity, something which, he thinks, no previous translator of Pope had been able to accomplish. It must be acknowledged that he succeeded remarkably well in this respect, for he reproduced Pope's couplets almost line for line. But to raise his work distinctively above that of his predecessors was clearly beyond his ability, for he lacked the essential characteristic of a Pope translator, that which Kretsch to a considerable degree possessed, namely, the power of poetic expression. His work was received, therefore, indifferently by an age the poetic standards of which were rapidly being raised far above the prosy level of Brockes and Bodmer. One of Harder's critics,¹ after speaking of the mistreatment Pope had received at the hands of his translators, sarcastically remarks that Harder, too, would have to answer on the final judgment day on Parnassus and that Pope, if he could see himself in this garb, would certainly recall his famous dictum, "Whatever is, is right."²

The severity of this criticism probably finds explanation in the fact that another translator of Pope's "Essay," Johann Georg Schlosser, had an interest in the journal. Schlosser, although a lawyer by profession, was a great lover of polite literature, and was associated with many of the most noted literary men during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. He was a friend of Goethe, became in 1773 his brother-in-law, and was associated with Goethe, Herder, Merck, and others, in the publication of the "Frankfurter gelehrten

¹ "Frankf. gel. Anz.," I (1772), 718 f.

² But see also the more favorable comments in the "Neuen Hallischen gelehrten Zeitungen," VI (1771), 753; and "Almanach d. d. Musen," Leipzig, 1773, p. 132.

Anzeigen" of 1772. Schlosser had, some ten years before the appearance of his translation in 1776, been engaged in writing in English heroic couplets in imitation of Pope a refutation of Pope's philosophy as set forth in the "Essay on Man," in which he attempted to show that man could be unhappy in spite of the perfection of the universe as a whole, and that revealed religion, disregarded by Pope, which shows man to be the final aim of creation, offered the only true comfort. Four books of the work were at that time completed and translated by him into German prose. Ten years later, after he had become much more conservative in his view of life and felt himself unable to complete the work, he made merely a rough draft of the fifth and final book in German and turned over the manuscript together with a prose translation of Pope's "Essay" to a friend, who published both together in one volume anonymously.¹ This translation of the "Essay" which was appended to the "Anti-Pope" probably for purposes of comparison, while written in clear, vigorous prose, cannot be said to add anything of importance to the numerous translations already in existence. The time had passed when prose, whatever its particular merits, was accepted as a satisfactory vehicle for translating any of Pope's works.²

The storm of criticism which Dusch's translation of Pope's works had called forth had done much to curtail its circulation. At any rate, during the twenty years following its issue no second edition of the work was published. In 1778, after the history of its first publication had generally been forgotten, a new edition was offered to the public.³ According to a statement by the editor⁴ this was a part of a comprehensive scheme of a society in Mannheim,⁵ whereby all the works of the most noted foreign literary men were to be made

¹ "Anti-Pope oder Versuch über den natürlichen Menschen. Nebst einer neuen prosaischen Uebersetzung von Pope's Versuch über den Menschen." Leipzig, 1776, in der Weygandschen Buchhandlung. The book was also published with the same title and date but different pagination in Bern, by Beat Ludwig Wallhard.

² In a review in "Almanach d. d. Musen," Leipzig, 1777, p. 118, this translation was regarded as the best that had thus far appeared.

³ "Des Alexander Pope Esq. sämtliche Werke mit Wilhelm Warburtons Commentar und Anmerkungen." Bd. I-VII, Strasburg, druckts Heitz und Dannbach, 1778; Bd. VIII, Mannheim, 1779.

⁴ "Nachricht an das Publikum," Bd. VIII.

⁵ The "Deutsche Gesellschaft." It numbered among its members Klopstock, Lessing, Wieland, and Schiller. Cf. B. Seuffert, Geschichte der deutschen Gesellschaft in Mannheim, "Anz. f. d. Altertum," VI (1880), 276 ff.

easily accessible to the German public. The best of the older translations were to be used and if necessary improved, and where translations did not exist new ones were to be made. The plan, which included about fifteen of the best known English writers, was never fully carried out. Pope had the honor of being the first of the foreign writers to be edited. The edition was an exact reprint of Dusch's work with all its mistakes. A long list of corrections and improvements were added, however, in the last volume¹ by Professor G. Eckert, who had the editing of this particular work in charge. These corrections were inserted in the text itself in the new edition that followed shortly after² and to which had been added by the editor a translation of Pope's correspondence, omitted by Dusch.³

The four translations of the "Essay on Man" which followed Schlosser's during the next fifteen years may likewise be regarded as contributing little to what had already been accomplished. The first of these is in prose by Benignus Pfeüfer from the Italian of Anton Philipps Adami, and was published in 1783.⁴ With the

¹ Bd. VIII, "Verbesserungen," pp. 239 ff.

² Mannheim, 1780-85, in 13 vols.

³ This was the only translation of Pope's "Letters" made during the eighteenth century that may be regarded as of any importance, although a number of individual letters or small collections had been published during this period. These are as follows: "Ein curiöser Brief des Herrn Pope's an den Hertzog von Buckingham" in: "Eine Sammlung allerhand auserlesener Morallscher und Satyrischer Meister-Stücke, aus dem Englischen übersetzt." Andere Probe, Berlin und Leipzig, bey Johann Andreas Rüdiger, 1783, pp. 235-244. "Pope im 48sten Brief an D. Arbuthnot" in: "Freymüthige Nachrichten," etc., Zürich, II, 195-96. "Abgesonderte Gedanken aus Pope's Briefen" in: "Die neuesten Sammlungen vermischter Schriften," Zürich, bey Johann Kaspar Ziegler, 1754, II, 263-93. "Miscellaneous Letters. Vermischte Briefe aus den besten Eng. Schriftstellern in ihrer Originalsprache, nebst beygefügter deutscher Uebersetzung mit einem Anhang von Kaufmannsbrieffen, ehemals von Herrn Theodor Arnold, bey dieser zweyten Auflage aber aufs neue übersetzt und zum Theil mit bessern Originalen versehen von M. J. J. Ebert. Leipzig und Züllichau, in der Waysenhaus und Frommannischen Handlung. 1763." About 30 letters from Pope are included here. This was, no doubt, a textbook intended primarily for Ebert's English classes at the Carolinum in Braunschweig, where Pope generally constituted a part of the curriculum. Cf. "Gelehrte Beyträge zu den Braunschweigischen Anzeigen," Bd. III (1763), St. 28: "Der Hr. Prof. Ord. Ebert wird in diesem halben Jahre, da er in dem vorigen mit denen, die die Anfangsgründe der Englischen Sprache gehört haben, auserlesene Stücke aus dem Tatler, Spectator, nebst einigen Popischen Briefen gelesen, darin fortfahren, und darauf zu leichtern poetischen Stücken übergehen." Kayser also quotes the following, which I have been unable to locate: "Popes Freundschaftlicher und literarischer Briefwechsel aus dem Englischen von G. K. S. Strebel. Nürnberg, 1761."

⁴ "Grundsätze der Moral, oder Alexanders Poppe [sic!] Versuch über den Menschen aus dem Italienischen Antons Philipps Adami ins Teutsche übersetzt von Benignus Pfeüfer. Bamberg, bey Vinzenz Dederich, Buchhändler. 1783." According to Kayser the work also appeared the same year with Frankfurt u. Leipzig upon the title-page. I have been unable to find such a copy. Adami's translation appeared in Padua, 1765.

exception of the anonymous verse translation of 1741, made from the French, this is the most distorted version of Pope's "Essay" that appeared in Germany. The translator, as he confesses in his introduction, knows no English and is not even familiar with Pope's name.

The second appeared the same year in Hamburg with Jakob Mumsen as its author.¹ We have here the first attempt at translating the "Essay on Man" in blank verse. When we consider, however, the great progress that had by this time been made in Germany in the use of this meter, Mumsen's use of it is clumsy indeed. Besides his very rough lines, his translation is not always as exact as the words in his title "eine genauere Uebersetzung" would lead us to expect, while at times his meaning is concealed by his awkward constructions. A revised edition appeared in 1809 in which the author claims to have corrected the inaccuracies of the first edition. But his corrections were few and were confined to rather unimportant details, so that the chief weakness of the work, its meter, remained practically unchanged.²

In 1790 another blank verse translation, of a similar character, which had evidently been sent to the editor of the "Neuen Teutschen Merkur" for criticism, was reviewed in that journal.³ Owing, no doubt, to the severity of the review, the complete translation never appeared in print. The fact is of special interest since Wieland was the reviewer and since he incidentally states the principles which in his opinion should guide every translator. He should follow the original closely but never to the extent of deviating from the idiom

¹ "Versuch über den Menschen von Alexander Pope. Eine genauere Uebersetzung. Hamburg, bey Hoffmann, 1783."

² His ignorance of the essential laws of rhythm in blank verse may be seen, for example, in his translation of the following lines:

Ask of thy mother earth, why oaks are made
Taller or stronger than the weeds they shade!
Or ask of yonder argent fields above
Why Jove's satellites are less than Jove! (Epistle I, ll. 39-42.)

Frag deine Mutter Erd, warum die Eichen
Viel höher wachsen als das Kraut, das sie
Beschatten? Spähe nach in jenen Silber-
Gefilden drüben, warum Jupiters
Trabanten kleiner sind als ihr Planet? (Epistle I, ll. 49-53.)

Both editions were unfavorably reviewed. Cf. e.g., "Allgemeines Verzeichnis neuer Bücher mit kurzen Anmerkungen," Leipzig, VIII (1784), 600; and "Morgenblatt für gebildete Stände," Dritter Jahrgang (1809), Uebersicht der neuesten Lit. No. 16, p. 63.

³ LXX, 200-9.

of his own language, or of misrepresenting the spirit or character of his author before his readers. Not infrequently, he thinks, it is necessary in justice to his author for purposes either of clarity or elegance to avoid his constructions, reproducing the original in less or in two or three times as many words. The style and the language of the author should be clearly distinguished and the former should be followed only in so far as is possible without violating the grammar, the usage and other peculiar characteristics of the language into which one translates. This, in his opinion, is a principle especially to be observed in Pope, whose unusually condensed style is a universally admired characteristic, and this is the principle which he finds his translator has most flagrantly violated.

This is likewise the fault of the translation in rhymed alexandrines which was published anonymously the following year.¹ The translator, according to his introduction, clearly sees the difficulty of his task and understands the principles according to which he must proceed. But in following them out he fails utterly. His translation is inaccurate and lacks clearness and harmony. Indeed, some of his passages are quite unintelligible apart from the English. At the close of his work he adds "Das allgemeine Gebet" and notes on the "Essay on Man." These are largely his own, either explaining the text or comparing the ideas of Pope with those of other writers.

Far more successful was the work of Friedrich Heinrich Bothe, a young writer of some promise, and known perhaps better as the translator of a collection of English Ballads, published in 1795, the year following the publication of his Pope translation. In 1793 Bothe had printed, through Gleim's encouragement and at his expense, the first epistle of the "Essay on Man," together with a few translations from the Greek.² The "Probe" was favorably reviewed in the "Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung"³ where he received important suggestions for improving what he had published and sufficient

¹ "Alexander Popes Versuch über den Menschen. Leipzig, bey Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf und Compagnie, 1791." This is not Mumsen's translation, as Goedeke (VIII, 715) suggests.

² "Probe einer Verdeutschung von Popens Versuch über den Menschen. Nebst einer Uebersetzung der Kriegslieder des Tyrtäus, von Friedrich Heinrich Bothe. Berlin, 1793."

³ 1793, cols. 310-12. Also "Neue Bibl. d. schönen Wiss.," LI (1794), 275.

encouragement to finish the work. The complete translation in which he had made use of the hints which had been given him appeared the following year and was dedicated to his patron Gleim.¹ It was accompanied by the English and by copious notes, partly his own, partly translated from the English edition which he used.²

Bothe, like Kretsch, had considerable talent as a versifier. Unlike any of the other translators of the "Essay on Man" in this century, he made use of the verse of the original interspersed with longer or shorter lines and occasionally other rhyme schemes. He introduced this variety, according to his introduction, because he felt the iambic pentameter to be too monotonous and solemn for a poetic epistle. But the more important reason was, no doubt, the difficulty of finding always the required rhyme, a problem which, as he himself acknowledged, caused him much trouble. Bothe is sometimes very happy in rendering Pope's lines, and excels Kretsch in adhering more closely to Pope's meter and style. Only occasionally is he inaccurate and prosy and compelled for metrical reasons to expand Pope's ideas unduly. He, himself, lays no claim to a perfect reproduction of Pope, but in spite of these deficiencies this must be regarded as the best German translation of the "Essay on Man" which the eighteenth century produced.³

We have still to add the blank verse translation of Broxtermann, published in 1798, a work which had no special merits above those

¹ "Alexander Pope's Versuch über den Menschen in vier Episteln an den Lord St. John von Bolingbroke. Englisch und deutsch mit Anmerkungen. Nebst den Kriegsliedern des Tyrtäus. Von Friedrich Heinrich Bothe. Halle in der Curtschen Buchhandlung, 1794."

² Pope's "Works," London, 1787.

³ The work was critically reviewed in the "Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung," 1795, cols. 557-60.

In 1794 were published two other unimportant translations, neither of which I was able to locate in the leading libraries of Germany: "Versuch über den Menschen; eine genaue Uebersetzung. Wien, Schaumburg und Comp., 1794." (Cf. Goed. VII, 697.) Whether this is a new translation, or merely a reprint of one of the many already discussed, I am unable to say. The other is a prose translation by G. F. Niemeyer in "Sammlung aus einigen der berühmtesten englischen Dichter, nämlich Pope, Milton, Dryden, Waller, Prior, Congreve, Gay, Young, Thomson, Gray, Akenside, Addison, Shakespeare, übersetzt von dem Verfasser des Greises an den Jüngling." Vol. I, Hannover, Ritscher, 1794. According to a review in the "Neuen allgemeinen deutschen Bibliothek" (XIX, Kiel, 1795, pp. 187 ff.), this volume is devoted to Pope and contains translations of the "Essay on Man," "Eloisa to Abelard," and "Sappho to Phaon." The reviewer thinks Pope, on account of his choice diction and beautiful harmony, to be the last poet who could be satisfactorily rendered in prose.

already reviewed.¹ The cause for its existence was to furnish an enterprising editor with material for the first volume of a contemplated series of translations of foreign didactic and narrative poems. The chief merit of the work is the fidelity with which the English is reproduced, its chief weakness the utter lack of every spark of poetry, both in its diction and in its meter.²

Besides the prose translation of Dusch in Pope's "Sämmtlichen Werken" (1758-64), no other complete German translation of the "Essay on Criticism" appeared until Eschenburg's was published in 1795.³ J. J. Eschenburg (1743-1820) was one of the leading literary mediators between England and Germany during the latter half of the eighteenth century, and the importance of his services in this direction has by no means been fully recognized. Born and reared in Hamburg at a time when English influence began to make itself strongly felt there, he later attended the University of Göttingen, known at this time for its strong interest in things English, and subsequently accepted a professorship in literature and philosophy in Braunschweig, where he, enjoying the friendship of such men as Ebert and Zacharia, was surrounded by a decidedly English literary atmosphere. As a result of this, Eschenburg acquired a wide acquaintance with English literature, which soon became evident through his extensive activities in this field. In addition to his well-known Shakespeare translation, he became also the chief interpreter to the Germans of his day of the more recent English aesthetic

¹ "Alexander Pope's Versuch über den Menschen an St. John Lord Bolingbroke. Eine metrische Uebersetzung, mit den nöthigsten Anmerkungen und Wilhelm Warburtons Commentar. Von T. W. Broxtermann. Osnabrück, in der Hofbuchhandlung bei Karl und Comp., 1799." The work has a second title-page: "Blüthen des Auslandes. Eine Sammlung von Uebersetzungen vorzüglicher besonders didactischer und erzählender Gedichte. Erstes Bändchen. Popen Versuch über den Menschen. Osnabrück, etc., 1798."

² There were in addition to these translations also two English editions of the "Essay on Man," which were published in Germany, apart from the collected works: "An Essay on Man. By Alexander Pope, Esq. A new edition, corrected. Mentz, printed for J. F. Schiller, 1786." Also: "A Philosophical Essay on Man, in four Epistles to H. John, Lord Bolingbroke, by Alex. Pope. Mit Bezeichnungen der Aussprache und Erklärung der Wörter, zum Selbstunterricht von J. H. Emmert, Professor zu Tübingen. Erfurt bey W. Hennings. 1797." Pope's "Essay on Man" thus became, along with Young's "Night Thoughts," Thomson's "Seasons," and Goldsmith's "Vicar of Wakefield," an elementary textbook in Germany for students of English.

³ "Pope's Versuch über die Kritik, verdeutscht von J. J. Eschenburg. Berlinisches Archiv der Zeit und ihres Geschmacks. Berlin, bei Friedrich Maurer," I (1795), 189-95; 270-83; 384-91. Two other editions of this translation with the English text were published in Wien in 1799 and 1800.

criticism by his annotated translations of the works of Daniel Webb, John Brown, Bishop Hurd, and Charles Burney. He was the first editor of the Hamburg "Unterhaltungen,"¹ a magazine reflecting the deep interest of its editor in English literature, and later published his "Brittischen Museum für die Deutschen"² and its successor, "Annalen der Brittischen Litteratur,"³ which were devoted exclusively to English literature and the material for which was entirely drawn from English literary journals and critical works. His "Entwurf einer Theorie und Litteratur der schönen Wissenschaften"⁴ also shows an intimate knowledge of English criticism and the "Beispielsammlung zur Theorie und Literatur der schönen Wissenschaften,"⁵ which was intended to furnish the illustrative material for the "Entwurf," contains many selections from English literature. Pope seems to have been his favorite, for he quotes him more frequently than any other author.⁶

In view of Eschenburg's reputation as an English scholar and a critic, and the general excellence of his Shakespeare translation, we should expect from him a translation of the "Essay on Criticism" far above the standard set by the translators of the "Essay on Man." In this we are disappointed. It is difficult to understand how Eschenburg, who himself claimed to be somewhat of a poet, could produce a work which in poetic expression and rhythm was so inferior as this translation, especially when we consider the time in which it appeared. He makes the mistake of using blank verse, which at its best would tend to destroy an essential characteristic of Pope's style, his sententiousness. He uses a blank verse, more-

¹ For the years 1766 and 1767 (4 vols.). The magazine was continued by Wittenberg and Ebeling to 1770.

² Leipzig, 1777-80, 6 vols.

³ Berlin u. Stettin, 1783.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1781.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1788-95.

⁶ On account of the importance of the work, it will not be out of place to cite the works of Pope which he here reprints. Vol. I (1788), pp. 148-72, "January and May"; pp. 270-74, "The Temple of Fame" (vss. 137-243); pp. 418-21, "Winter." Vol. II (1788), pp. 38-39, "On a Certain Lady at Court" and "Epitaph. On Mr. Elijah Fenton"; pp. 165-169, "Prologue to the Satires"; pp. 291-300, "Essay on Man" (Ep. III, vss. 109-268) and "Moral Essays" (Ep. I, vss. 99-173). Vol. III (1789), pp. 116-20, "Essay on Criticism" (vss. 68-200); pp. 253-56, "Windsor Forest" (vss. 147-258); pp. 407-10, "To Miss Blount, with the Works of Voiture." Vol. V (1790), pp. 403-0, "The Rape of the Lock" (Canto III). Vol. VI (1791), pp. 241-65, "Eloisa an Abälard nach Pope" by Eschenburg, both English and German; pp. 380-84, "Ode for Music on St. Cecilia's Day." Vol. VIII (1795), pp. 117-23, Pope's letter to Hugh Bethel, June 17, 1728, and one to Dr. Arbuthnot, July 26, 1734.

over, that rises little above the level of mere prose. Like many of the translators of the "Essay on Man," he attempts a line-for-line reproduction, and to attain to this literalness he finds himself compelled to sacrifice Pope's poetic qualities.¹ Only rarely is he guilty of inexactness, however, as for example when he translates Pope's "wits" (vs. 38) by "poet," or "open vowels" (vs. 345) by "Gleichlaut."²

There was a similar attempt at the close of the century to revive an interest in two other works of Pope that, on account of changed literary ideals, had for several decades been practically forgotten. These are the "Rape of the Lock" and the "Moral Essays." After Zacharia's admirable imitations of Pope's mock-heroic about the middle of the century,³ the species degenerated into insipid trivialities which soon became disgusting to the public. It was due to this as well as to a growing interest for a literature of a deeper moral and emotional content that the interest in the mock-heroic gradually died out. The only translation of Pope's "Rape of the Lock" which appeared in Germany during the last half of the century is no contradiction to this statement, for it is nothing more than a distorted shadow of Pope's work.

This was published in 1797 by G. Merkel.⁴ It is interesting to note the unqualified admiration this translator still has for Pope at

¹ The following lines from the beginning of the "Essay" will illustrate this weakness:

Schwer ist zu sagen, ob mehr Ungeschick
Wer schlecht schreibt, oder schlecht beurtheilt, zeigt.
Doch, minder sündiget, wer die Geduld
Ermüdet, als, wer den Geschmack verfälscht.
Wie Jener, sind gen Wenige; wie Dieser,
Verfälschen Viele. Gegen Einen, der
Schlecht schreibt, urtheilen zehn verkehrt; sonst macht
Ein Dichterling allein sich lächerlich;
Jetzt macht er viele Narr'n in Prosa mehr.

² In the "Wiener Musenalmanach auf das Jahr 1794" (pp. 21-25) was published a "Probe einer Uebersetzung von Pops Versuch über die Kritik" by J. F. Ratschky. It is a translation of the first 45 lines of the Essay in alexandrines.

In addition to this should be mentioned the Latin version: "Alexandri Pope de Arte Critica Liber. Essay on Criticism. Poema Anglicum carmine latino reddere tentavit Jo. Jac. Collenbusch, Ecclesiastes Breckerfeldensis. Dessau 1782." The English text accompanies the translation and the main purpose of the work, according to the introduction, was to furnish a convenient text for those wishing to combine the study of Latin and English.

There appeared also the following German reprint of the Essay in English: "An Essay on Criticism. Written in the year 1719. By Alexander Pope Esq." Halle, printed by J. J. Gebauer, 1758.

³ The best of these, "Der Renommist" was published in 1744.

⁴ "Der Lockenraub, ein scherzhaftes Heldengedicht von A. Pope, frey und metrisch übersetzt von G. Merkel. Leipzig, bey Joh. Gottlob Feind, 1797."

the very close of the century. Voltaire's statement made in 1726, in which he calls Pope the greatest poet not only of England but of the whole world, he thinks could still be accepted in its widest significance, if Germany had no Wieland. Goethe and Schiller do not seem to enter his mind in this connection.

He knows, he says, of but a single translation of the "Rape of the Lock," namely the prose version of Dusch in the collected works of Pope. He tries to account for this by the fact that this kind of work presents greater difficulties in translation than any other. Wit, he thinks, is of all products of the human spirit the most fleeting. To make a work like the "Rape of the Lock" intelligible, therefore, without a commentary, it must be modernized. This is the principle upon which he proceeds in his translation. The result is that he distorts the meaning in Pope's poem beyond recognition. To make his work the more interesting to his German readers, he substitutes German names for the English, while in other parts he drags in German names for no purpose whatever. He adds much material of his own and freely omits or changes the text. But instead of clarifying Pope's work for his German readers, the translator reduces it to a chaotic mass of meaningless hexameters.¹

A translation of four of Pope's Epistles in 1800² shows a similar attempt to awaken an interest in a species of literature all but dead. These efforts, however, especially the numerous translations of the "Essay on Man" which had appeared during the last quarter of the century furnish excellent evidence of the tenacity with which no inconsiderable part of the cultured German public still clung to ideals essentially in opposition to the prevailing literary taste of the time.

¹ Mention should also be made here of the translation of two passages of the poem under the title: "Proben einer neuen Uebersetzung von Pope's 'Lockenraub'" by an anonymous author signing himself "D." The parts translated were Canto I, vs. 47-142, and Canto III, vs. 19-100: "Deutsche Monatschrift," Leipzig, I (1798), 89-96.

² "Moral Essays in Four Epistles to several Persons. By Alexander Pope, Esq., with explanatory Notes. Vienna, printed for R. Sammer, Bookseller, 1800." With a second title: "Moralische Versuche in vier Briefen an verschiedene Personen. Aus dem Englischen des Alexander Pope übersetzt, mit erläuternden Anmerkungen. Wien bey Rudolph Sammer, Buchhändler, 1800." The work is anonymous and contains no introduction. It is in prose, both the English and the German text being given of the first four Moral Epistles.

A translation of Epistle I was also made by Samuel Gottlieb Bürde and published in the "Schlesischen Monatschrift," I (1792), 281-91.

5. *Pope and the Beginnings of German Romanticism*

While the translations just discussed were primarily produced and read by men who represented the declining rationalistic movement, Pope was not without interest for those who stood for the new literary ideals. In England, Byron's great interest in Pope is the most notable example. Among the German writers of the Storm and Stress movement a prominent illustration is found in Lenz, who was at the same time a most extravagant worshiper of Shakespeare. Before going to Strassburg he had translated the "Essay on Criticism" and while there he read before the famous literary coterie which had gathered there in the years 1770 and 1771 a translation of Pope's first "Dialogue" from the "Epilogue to the Satires," presenting it as a model for satire. In the preface to this translation he calls Pope a writer from whom one could never arise without feeling himself larger, nobler, and freer.¹

But there are also several works of Pope which, on account of their emotional or lyric content, were in perfect accord with the romantic tendencies of the last half of the century. These are principally "Eloise to Abelard" and the "Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady," but there should also be added here, on account of their lyric qualities, the two odes, "On St. Cecilia's Day" and "The Dying Christian to His Soul." These pieces, all of them composed in the author's earlier years, found little favor in Germany until the eighth decade when the Storm and Stress movement was well under way, showing in this respect a decided contrast to his other works.

The translation of "Eloise to Abelard" made from a French version and published in 1760 has already been mentioned.² Five years before this a prose rendering of the poem from the original, together with a translation of an English version of the correspondence between Eloise and Abelard,³ was published in Berlin and

¹ Lenz sought a publisher for his translation of the "Essay on Criticism" in Berlin on his way to Strassburg, but without success. Neither of the translations appeared in print. Cf. Karl H. Clarke, *Lenz' Uebersetzungen aus dem Englischen*, "Zs. f. vergl. Litg.," Neue Folge, X (1896), 413 ff.

² Above, p. 9.

³ The anonymous author merely states that his source for these Letters is English. It is probably Hughes's translation from the French made in 1714, which is also regarded as Pope's source.

Potsdam.¹ The translator attempts to reproduce the original closely, but his lack of perfect familiarity with the English language is everywhere apparent.² The extremely wooden prose into which the work was cast robbed it of all its original beauty, so that it received but little attention.³ This was likewise the fate of a Swiss translation in blank verse published in 1768 anonymously.⁴ Although not always accurate, it expresses far better the high poetic quality which Pope's work possesses and deserved on this account more general recognition.

The individualistic tendencies of the latter part of the century, along with the growing insistence upon a deeper emotional content in literature, aroused a new interest in the lyric. The German Volkslied and the English ballad became the object of serious study, so that the trifling and insipid verses of the Anacreontic poets were rapidly being supplanted in the early seventies by a more serious and soulful expression in the lyrics of men like Hölty, the Stolbergs, Matthias Claudius, and especially Goethe. It is due chiefly to this movement that the lyrical pieces of Pope were at this time beginning to receive greater attention.

Schmid's "Anthologie" for the year 1771 brought forth reprints of both Mendelssohn's and Kretsch's translations of "The Dying

¹ "Die Geschichte und Briefe des Abelards und der Eloise, in welchen ihr Unglück und die verdrieszlichen Folgen ihrer Liebe beschrieben sind. Nebst einem Gedichte Eloise an Abelard von Alexander Pope. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt. Berlin und Potsdam, bey Christian Friedrich Voss, 1755."

Ramler in a letter to Gleim, September 14, 1748, refers to a translation that had appeared in a moral weekly published in Jena. This I have been unable to trace. Ramler says: "Es ist auch in Jena eine Wochenschrift herausgekommen: die Wochenschrift nach der Mode genannt. . . . Die Uebersetzungen sind das einzige Gute an dieser Chartesque. Plutarch von der Neugierigkeit, Popens Brief der Eloise an den Abelard und ein Traum von dem Nachruhm aus dem Englischen Schwätzer sind von diesem deutschen Schwätzer übersetzt." Briefwechsel zwischen Gleim und Ramler, hrag. von Carl Schüdekopf. Bd. I, Tübingen, 1906.

² Mistakes like the following occur: "to the hollow wind" (l. 156) = "dem hohlen Wege" (p. 233); "And swelling organs lift the rising soul" (l. 272) = "und aufgeblasne Segel die empörte Seele erheben" (p. 239); "In each low wind methinks a Spirit calls, and more than Echoes talk along the walls" (ll. 305-6) = "In jedem sanften Winde ruft ein Geist, und etwas mehr. Denn der Wiederhall redet längst den Mauern" (p. 241).

³ The contemporary journals generally ignored it, although Lessing published a notice of it in the "Berlinischen privilegierten Zeitung," 1755, St. 45. Cf. "Schriften," *op. cit.* 7, 23. In this he merely calls attention to the story of the two lovers, but makes no comment on the translation.

⁴ "Poetische Uebersetzungen aus dem Griechischen und nach dem Englischen. Zürich bey Füesslin und Compagnie, 1766." The copy which I have examined is in the Stadtbibliothek of Zürich. The copy in the British Museum lacks the title-page, but is the same in every other respect. In the printed catalogue the probable date of the work is erroneously given as 1780.

Christian to His Soul"¹ and the following year an anonymous rendering of the somewhat frivolous "To Lady Wortly Montague."² Herder likewise was attracted to "The Dying Christian to His Soul" and published two years later a reproduction of it which appeared in a number of reprints, the one most widely circulated being that in Schmid's "Almanach der deutschen Musen."³ With slight changes this version was set to music by Freiherr von Dalberg and performed with considerable success.⁴ This translation of Herder's was followed in 1793 by another by Bürde, the translator of Milton's "Paradise Lost."⁵ The popularity of Dryden's "Alexander's Feast," which had been successfully produced in Germany in Händel's musical setting, attracted attention likewise to Congreve's "To Harmony," and Pope's "On St. Cecilia's Day," which treated the same subject. As early as 1758 Christian Felix Weisse published a translation of Pope's ode in the appendix to his "Scherzhaften Gedichten," and it appeared again together with translations of Dryden's and Congreve's odes in later editions of his poems.⁶

Another attempt at translating this work of Pope with but indifferent success appeared in the "Teutschen Merkur" of 1796.⁷ More happy in overcoming the special difficulties which the changing movement of this ode imposed upon the translator was Kosegarten, who, like Weisse, reproduced also the odes of Dryden and Congreve.⁸

It is somewhat surprising that Pope's "Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady" was not more popular in Germany during the last quarter of the century when literature was so generally characterized by the expression of emotion and sentiment. The character of the "unfortunate lady" is thoroughly romantic and Pope produced nothing which in genuine tenderness and pathos exceeds this poem. The only translation that was made of it in Germany during this

¹ II, 344 f.

² III, 334.

³ Leipzig, 1776, p. 191.

⁴ In regard to the various reprints of this translation both with the musical setting and without, cf. "Herders Werke," D.N.L., 74, p. 446, note.

⁵ Voss's "Musenalmanach," 1793, pp. 67 f.

⁶ In his "Kleinen lyrischen Gedichten," Leipzig, 1772, sec. ed. Wien, 1793. For "Pope's Ode auf die Musik" see former ed., III, 173 ff.

⁷ II, 97 ff. The translation is signed "D.M."

⁸ "Rhapsodien von Ludwig Theobul Kosegarten." Leipzig, 3 Bde., 1790-1801. III, 14 ff., "Preis der Tonkunst. Nach Pope."

period was that of G. L. Spalding¹ whose extremely stiff and halting alexandrines could convey to his German readers no notion of the beauty of the English poem.²

The love of the morbidly sentimental, which found its expression at this time in the numerous imitations of Goethe's "Werther" and of works like Sterne's "Sentimental Journey," awakened likewise an interest in Pope's "Eloise to Abelard." This work, published as early as 1717, makes Pope one of the forerunners of the Romanticists, for its spirit was essentially out of harmony with the age which produced it and forecast, through its genuine emotional content, the coming of a new era. It is no doubt on account of its decidedly romantic tendencies that Pope came later to look with disfavor upon this remarkable work of his earlier years. In Germany the period of greatest popularity of "Eloise to Abelard" falls into the last two decades of the eighteenth and the first of the nineteenth century. During the twenty-five years between 1779 and 1804 no less than ten different translations of the poem were published, while the two most important of them, those of Eschenburg and Bürger, were several times reprinted.

Eschenburg's "Eloise an Abelard" in blank verse, published in his "Brittischen Museum für die Deutschen" in 1779,³ was the first German translation of the work that attracted any considerable number of readers. We have already seen the method which Eschenburg followed in his Pope translations. Possessing a critical rather than a poetical faculty, he adhered closely to the thoughts of his author, often at the expense of smoothness of verse and choice of expression. This we saw was the weakness of his "Versuch über die Kritik." However, in his "Eloise an Abelard" he avoided most of

¹ First printed in Voss's "Musenalmanach," 1793, pp. 51 ff., and again in Spalding's "Versuch didaktischer Gedichte," Berlin, 1804, pp. 64 ff. In regard to a criticism of this translation, cf. "Neue Bibl. d. sch. Wiss.," 1793, XL, 114.

² Here are also to be included a few of the less important translations made from Pope. These are: "Grabeschrift, nach Pope" ("Well then, poor G. lies under ground"), by L. Herz, "Wiener Musenalmanach," 1792, p. 34; and by the same: "Uebersetzung des ersten Psalms zum Gebrauche junger Mädchen. Nach Pope," *ibid.*, 1793, p. 90. "Der Werth nach Pope," Schiller's "Musenalmanach," 1799, p. 173. About twenty of Pope's shorter poems were reprinted in Jos. Retzer's "Choice of the Best Poetical Pieces of the Most Eminent English Poets," 6 vols. Vienna, 1783-86.

³ V, 345 ff. It appeared again with the English text in Eschenburg's "Beispiel-sammlung"; see above, p. 38. With the original and Bürger's translation it was reprinted in Wien, 1799, and again with the English, Wien, 1800. (Cf. Goedeke, VII, 715.)

these glaring faults in his blank verse and reproduced with considerable success the solemn cadence of Pope's verse and the deep passion that speaks through his lines.

This translation of Eschenburg was followed in 1784 by another in prose.¹ In a short preface the editor regards this work of Pope as one of those to which every new translation brings new interest. "Unvergesslich," he says, "sind in der Geschichte Abelard und Eloise. Unvergesslich ist in Europens Dichtkunst Popen's vortreffliche Heroide, die er in Eloisens Seele dichtete." The translator, who signs himself "v.A.," he regards as a man of more than ordinary genius.² However, this prose translation, although carefully done, did not bring the new interest which was promised, because it failed to give the reader an adequate idea of the high poetic qualities of the work.³

Of all the German translators of Pope during this century Bürger possessed the greatest poetic gifts. His "Heloise an Abelard" stands out distinctly from among the other Pope translations of this period.⁴ The tragic passion of the work no doubt attracted him, for that was the sort of subject in which he felt himself master. It is hardly to be expected that a poet like Bürger, with his love for rhetorical flights, would reproduce a work of this sort without coloring it with his own peculiar poetic genius. His method of translation was, therefore, entirely different from that of Eschenburg. He had no special regard for the letter of his original, his chief aim being rather to reproduce in his own way the same passionate emotions which Pope had put into his poem. He never hesitated, if it suited

¹ "Eloise an Abelard, nach Pope." Für Aeltere Litteratur und Neuere Lectüre. Quartal Schrift. Leipzig, hrg. von Canzler und Melszner, II, 37 ff.

² I have been unable to find any reference to the previous separate print of this translation which the editor mentions in the preface.

³ A translation of the "Messiah," likewise in prose, was published the same year under the following title: "Der Messias, eine geistige Ekloge. In einer Nachahmung des Pollio des Virgils. Uebersetzt aus dem Englischen des Herrn Pope." Preface signed "L.W.H.T." and dated Braunschweig, 1784. The English text accompanies the German.

⁴ First published in Göttinger "Musenalmanach," 1793, pp. 3-32. The work was practically completed as early as 1791. In a letter to A. W. Schlegel, dated October 31 of that year, Bürger says: "Meine Reimkunst in der Nuss ist auch fertig; sowie auch Popen's Heloise an Abelard fast zu Ende gediehen ist. Letzteres ist ein gar feines Werklein."—"Briefe von und an Gottfried August Bürger." Hrg. von A. Strodtmann, Berlin, 1874. IV, 136. With a free prose translation by J. Rothstein and one in French by Colardeau it was reprinted by Orell, Füssli und Compagnie, 1803.

his purpose, to rearrange, to omit entirely, or to expand Pope's thoughts, so that the translation is much longer than the original poem. He used Pope's own method of translation, to a certain extent making of the English work a German original.¹ Some of his friends to whom he sent his translation before it was published felt that he had overstepped the limits of the translator by injecting into it too much of himself. Thus Caroline Böhmer writes to F. L. W. Meyer: "Eloise ist ein paarmal Bürger geworden."² Georg Forster in a letter to Bürger praises the work highly and thinks that he has overcome very successfully the difficulties which face the German translator of English works. "Nach den Abänderungen die wir wünschen," he continues, "wird Ihre Arbeit unter den poetischen Uebersetzungen immer um die Oberstelle ringen."³ Similar praise was likewise given in a review in the "Neuen Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften." "Die Fülle des Ausdrucks," the reviewer says, "der Wohlklang der Versification, der rasche Gang durch die mannichfaltigsten Empfindungen erheben diese Heroide zu der Klasse der besten Werke dieses Dichters und so mit zu dem Vorzüglichsten, was unsre Sprache in dieser Gattung besitzt."⁴

During the same year another translation in alexandrines by E. A. Schmid was published in the "Neuen Teutschen Merkur."⁵ The work, however, is of no special merit for it not only fails to reproduce at all adequately the deep emotional quality of the work, but the translator is frequently compelled for the sake of rhyme to omit some of the most striking figures of the poem.⁶

In spite of the great variety of translations that had already appeared, the great popularity of "Eloise to Abelard" during the early years of the Romantic school brought forth a number of new versions including one in Latin hexameter by G. L. Spalding, whose own work shows him to have been an industrious student of Pope.⁷

¹ While Bürger was at work upon his translation of Homer, Pope's translation was the subject of frequent comment between himself and his friends. Cf. "Briefe," etc., *op. cit.*, I, 324; II, 187; III, 67 and 143.

² G. Waitz, "Caroline," Leipzig, 1871, I, 99.

³ "Briefe," etc., *op. cit.*, IV, 207.

⁴ XL (1793), 93.

⁵ LXXIX, 378-407.

⁶ According to Goedeke (VII, 715) another metrical translation appeared in "Ubiens Musentafel," 1799.

⁷ "Eloisa Abelardo" in "Versuch didaktischer Gedichte," Berlin, 1804, pp. 212 ff.

The best of these translations is that by Sophie Mereau (Brentano), who was able to combine with considerable success poetic form and fidelity to the original.¹

CONCLUSION

The close connection between the literary doctrines for which Pope stood and those of the French classical school, represented chiefly by Boileau, assured an immediate and wide popularity of Pope in France. Through the numerous translations and criticisms of his work which appeared there as a result of this popularity, Pope first became generally known on the continent. On this account a number of the early German Pope translations were made indirectly from the French.

There were, however, two German literary centers that had maintained since the third decade a direct literary connection with England, chiefly through their interest in the English moral weeklies. These were Hamburg and Zürich. From these centers came the first German translations of Pope made directly from the English. In Hamburg it was Brockes who first interested himself prominently in Pope and who in his translation of the "Essay on Man" produced the first of a series of Pope translations which came from northern Germany. In Switzerland the Bodmer-Gottsched controversy materially furthered this interest in Pope in that both parties sought to justify their literary doctrines by his example. It was due to this dispute that the first German reproduction of the "Essay on Criticism" and "The Dunciad" were made.

The climax of Pope's popularity came in the sixth decade when Lessing, Mendelssohn, and Nicolai became his chief interpreters. The translations made during the latter half of the century owe their existence chiefly to the two more or less clearly defined literary currents which ran through this period. The declining Rationalistic movement perpetuated the interest in those works of Pope which, like the "Essay on Man" and the "Essay on Criticism," represented best those literary doctrines. The rising Romantic movement, on the other hand, sought by numerous translations to popularize those works of Pope which on account of their Romantic tendencies had, up

¹ "Kalathiskos von Sophie Mereau," Erstes Bändchen, Berlin, 1801, pp. 105-32.

to this time, aroused little or no interest. The majority of the translations of the most important of these, "Eloise to Abelard," fell thus into the last years of the eighteenth and the early years of the nineteenth century.

The translations themselves were, for the most part, inferior in character, the reasons being: first, the general ignorance of the English language, especially during the earlier years of the period; secondly, the undeveloped state of the German poetic language; thirdly, the special difficulties which Pope offered to his German translators, such as his extreme brevity and his polished diction, which were difficult to imitate and without which his thoughts often appeared commonplace.

These numerous efforts to reproduce the much admired characteristics of Pope's style contributed no inconsiderable share to the rapid development which the German poetic language underwent during the last half of the century.

J. H. HEINZELMANN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE SPENSERIAN STANZA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY¹

For the seventeenth century I was able to find in the regular Spenserian stanza only 18 poems by 5 men; in the eighteenth century my list includes 57 poems by 38 known poets and 8 anonymous writers. It has so often been said that Thomson's "Castle of Indolence"² in 1748, or, at the very earliest, Akenside's "Virtuoso,"³ or Shenstone's "Schoolmistress" in 1737 were the first instances of the Spenserian stanza in the eighteenth century, that it is worth while to speak in detail of the Spenserian poems of the first half of the century.

In 1702, Edward Bysshe, Gentleman, wrote in his *Art of English Poetry*, p. 33: "Spencer has composed his 'Fairy Queen' in Stanzas of 9 Verses, where the 1st rhymes to the 3d, the 2d to the 4th, 5th, and 7th; and the 6th to the two last. But this Stanza is very difficult to maintain, and the unlucky choice of it reduc'd him often to the necessity of making use of many exploded Words; nor has he, I think, been follow'd in it by any of the Moderns."

I have not seen the first edition, but the second edition, 1705, "corrected and improved," seems to have its changes chiefly in the third part, the "Collection of the most Natural, Agreeable, and Sublime Thoughts." In 1705, at any rate, Bysshe was fairly within bounds in his statement that Spenser had not been followed "by any of the Moderns," for Dr. Samuel Woodford in 1679 was, so far as I know, the latest user of the regular Spenserian stanza. About 1705, however, Alexander Pope wrote the five stanzas of his "Spenserian Imitation, The Alley." It is commonly considered burlesque; to call it serious is too much, but it is also too much to say that it

¹ See *Modern Philology*, IV, 639, April, 1907, for "The Spenserian Stanza before 1700."

² Thomson's "revival in the 'Castle of Indolence' of the Spenserian stanza," Austin Dobson in Chambers' *Encyclopaedia of English Lit.*, II, 11a, 1903.

³ Akenside "published the 'Virtuoso,' a poem in Spenserian stanzas, which preceded in publicity both Thomson's and Shenstone's efforts in that form, the honor of reviving which should therefore rest with Akenside."—Edmund Gosse, *Eighteenth Century Lit.*, 311. Mr. Gosse had forgotten that on p. 138 he had said that Croxall had "issued two cantos in imitation of the 'Fairy Queen.'"

ridicules Spenser. The truth is, as we shall see, when we come to the comments on Spenser, that Pope, like many another youthful poet, experimented with various meters, and in the end used the form which best suited his habit of mind: Coleridge, for example, who certainly possessed some of the poetical qualities which Pope has been accused of lacking, also tried the Spenserian stanza in his youth, tried it only once, and without conspicuous success. Pope's stanzas seem to have been first published in 1727, so that they were preceded in print by those of Samuel Croxall, D.D., who in 1713 published a poem in the regular Spenserian stanza, entitled: "An Original Canto of Spencer: Design'd as Part of his 'Fairy Queen,' but never printed. Now made public by Nestor Ironside, Esq." Though this poem was dated 1714, the *Examiner* of December 18, 1713, animadverted upon it, and called forth on December 19, 1713, the "Examiner Examin'd." In 1714, Nestor Ironside put forth "Another Original Canto," etc., while the "Original Canto" went into its second and third editions. Later in 1714 appeared "An Ode, humbly inscrib'd to the King, occasion'd by his Majesty's most auspicious accession and arrival, written in the stanza and measure of Spenser. By Mr. Croxall," who naively subscribed himself "Author of the Two Original Cantos," etc. Although these "Original Cantos" were frankly satirical, the "Ode to the King" was an entirely serious poem, in which allegory was made to serve, not satire, but flattery.

A year later, in 1715, John Hughes published an edition of Spenser, the first since 1679, and which seems to have sufficed until 1750, when a second edition appeared. There may have been some connection between Croxall and Hughes, but I have not been able to trace it.

After Croxall's poems of 1714, the next poems in the regular stanza are William Thompson's in 1736, more than twenty years later; at no other time in the eighteenth century, however, was there a gap of more than eight years. Professor Phelps, who called attention to Thompson in 1893, in his *Beginnings of the English Romantic Movement*, has pointed out not only Thompson's importance as a pioneer in Romanticism, but also that he has substantial claims upon our attention as a graceful poet and a genuine lover of nature.

Thompson's "Epithalamium on the Royal Nuptials of May, 1736," and "The Nativity, a College Exercise" are both entirely serious poems, without a hint of satire and with many beautiful, melodious stanzas. Mark Akenside's "Virtuoso," therefore, which appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1737, was preceded, as we have seen, by at least six poems in the regular stanza. Akenside was followed in the same year by Shenstone, whose "Schoolmistress" was then printed in imperfect form, and completed in 1742. In 1739 appeared two poems, the "Abuse of Travelling," which we know is by Gilbert West, and "A Canto of the Fairy Queen," which seems to be his. In 1747, Robert Bedingfield, Dr. Gloster Ridley, and Christopher Pitt all published Spenserian imitations, so that James Thomson's "Castle of Indolence" (the longest Spenserian poem of the century), had a fairly long list of recent predecessors.

The "Castle of Indolence," it will be remembered, came out only four years after Pope's death, at a time when Pope's influence was presumably at its height; yet the poem was immediately popular, for the *London Magazine* for September, 1748, noted the appearance of the second edition. Moreover, Thomson was far from being the only Spenserian who was read in those days: Dodsley's famous *Collection*, the first three volumes of which appeared in January, 1748, and which went through five editions in ten years, contained Shenstone's "Schoolmistress," Gilbert West's "Abuse of Travelling," Gloster Ridley's "Psyche," Bedingfield's "Education of Achilles," and the elder William Melmoth's "Transformation of Lycon and Euphormio." The first half of the eighteenth century, then, the period when the vogue of the heroic couplet was surely at its highest, produced 18 poems in the stanza of Spenser—exactly as many as I have been able to find in the entire seventeenth century; and these 18 poems were by 13 poets, as against 5 in the seventeenth century. What is still more to the point, the poems of Akenside, Shenstone, and James Thomson are still known by reputation, and those of William Thompson ought to be, while not one of the seventeenth-century poems is known except to the special student.

Along with these fairly numerous poems in the regular stanza were many imitations, some of which are especially interesting. In 1706, Prior, in his "Ode to the Queen," invented one which in its

structure seems characteristically Classical. It is composed of two heroic quatrains and a couplet, with the second line of the couplet an Alexandrine. In the course of the century, 23 poets wrote 34 poems in this stanza, so that it was at times nearly as popular as the regular stanza, although it by no means displaced it. Samuel Wesley, the younger, between 1724 and 1735, wrote three poems in this stanza. In 1741, Samuel Boyse, one of the literary vagabonds of his day, wrote in it 140 stanzas of "Cambuscan; or the Squire's Tale of Chaucer." George Ogle continued "Cambuscan" for 74 stanzas, "from the 4th Book of Spenser's 'Fairy Queen'"; and in 1785, Joseph Sterling added another 97 stanzas. Ogle's paraphrase is one of the very few attempts in the eighteenth century to "modernize" Spenser, and is the only one of technical interest.¹

¹ Of Ogle's 74 stanzas, 73 are paraphrases of the "Fairy Queen," IV, II, 35-54; IV, III, 1-52; and IV, IV, 1, so that only one stanza (his last) is entirely his own. In a third of the stanzas, Ogle uses Spenser's Alexandrines with slight changes; only eight of them does he take unchanged. And so it is with the stanzas as wholes: Spenser's ideas are there, but phrasing and cadence are gone for the most part. In 14 stanzas there is no trace of Spenser's lines; in 13, only three lines can by any stretch be called Spenser's, and in only 17 stanzas does Ogle borrow more than three lines. In fact, of the more than 650 lines, only 42 are taken unchanged; in a dozen the order only is altered; in 86 only one word is changed; that is to say, only about 2½ per cent of Ogle's lines owe their form to Spenser. Some of Ogle's changes were mere substitutions of modern for archaic words, as in

	Pardon to grant, and rigor to abate
for Spenser's	To graunt her boone, and rigour to abate,
or	And chang'd, at Pleasure, for those Sons of thine,
for Spenser's	And chaung'd at pleasure for those imps of thine.
Others seem matters of cadence, like	
	And know the utmost measure of their date
for Spenser's	And know the measure of their utmost date,
or	And each to other seem'd the vict'ry there to yield
for Spenser's	And each to other seemd the victorie to yield.
Most of them, however, were injections of eighteenth-century taste, as in	
for	Tost like the vessel on the surging wave
or	Tossing them like a boate amid the mayne,
or	Soon as the face of Heav'n was streak'd with red,
for	So soon as heavens window shewed light.

In 1774, and again in 1783, there were anonymous attempts to turn Spenser into blank verse. Of the later of these, the *Monthly Review* for October, 1785, wrote:

"An attempt of this kind may be intended to render Spenser . . . more agreeable, by breaking the tedious uniformity of the stanza, of which most readers are apt to complain.

"The pause is not sufficiently marked, nor sufficiently varied; which renders the blank verse as tiresome as the stanza, the kind of poetry which, after all, will be found the most proper for Spenser's thoughts and descriptions."

In 1747 appeared in this stanza anonymously "A New Canto of Spenser's 'Fairy Queen,'" ascribed to John Upton who published an edition of Spenser in 1758. Samuel Boyse also was not too careful in his language, for in 1748 he wrote in this ten-line stanza "Irene, an Heroic Ode in the Stanza of Spenser." In 1749, Gilbert West used the stanza, which he called "Decades," to translate Pindar's "First Pythian Ode," which seems to have inspired an anonymous translator, the next year, of Pindar's "Eighth Isthmian."

Besides this popular one of Prior's, there were 13 other ten-line stanzas in the eighteenth century, which were modeled on Spenser's. Akenside invented one, rhyming *ababccdeed* which he used in three "Odes," and which at least three other poets copied in short poems. Thomas Chatterton used repeatedly one which rhymes *ababbcbdd*,⁵⁶ and which he probably invented, although William Browne of Tavistock had used the rhyme scheme without the concluding Alexandrine.

Of nine-line variations of Spenser's stanza, there were 18 stanza-forms, in 22 poems by 14 poets. The only one used by more than two poets rhymes *ababccdd*;⁵⁶ I found it first in Robert Lloyd's "Progress of Envy," March, 1751. Lloyd was followed by Robert Ferguson in 1773, and by Thomas Dermody in 1792. Lloyd prefaced his poem with this statement:

As I did not suppose that Imitators were bound to transcribe the Faults as well as Excellencies of their Originals, I made no Scruple of making a slight Alteration in Spenser's Stanza, which is universally condemned for the Redundancy of its correspondent Rhymes. . . . I have, in general, rather wished to fall into Spenser's Way of Thinking than his Manner of cloathing his Sentiments, because I think his Imagery infinitely superior to his Stile.

In 1767, Walter Harte tried an interesting variation which runs *ababbcded*, but he tried it in only one short poem and so far as I know has not been imitated. In 1785, an anonymous poet in the *London Magazine* published a poem which rhymed *ababbcbcb*;⁵⁶

perhaps the five *b*-rhymes had something to do with his stopping at the end of the fourth stanza. The most surprising of these nine-line stanzas, *abbacddc*, William Sotheby used, and apparently

invented, in 1798 for the 910 stanzas of his translation of Wieland's "Oberon." Wieland's poem is in octosyllabic couplets, but if "Oberon" suggested the "Fairy Queen," it is strange that Sotheby should have devised so strange a variation of Spenser's stanza, when he had the sanction not only of the "Fairy Queen," but of the "Castle of Indolence" and the "Minstrel." Only one poet—Thomas Park, in eight "Stanzas on the Death of Dame Morris" in 1797—used the Spenserian rhyme-scheme, but with a septenary instead of an Alexandrine.¹ All of these nine-line variations come after 1750, and very few of them had been used in the seventeenth century. The most notable omission is that the eighteenth century did not once, so far as I know, use the *ottava rima* with an added Alexandrine.

After the true Spenserian stanza, and the ten-line variation of Prior, comes in point of use the *ababcc* stanza with its last line lengthened. At various times through the century 16 poets wrote 30 poems, all short, the two longest late in the century by Anna Seward and Robert Southey, having each 47 stanzas.² As in the case of the seventeenth century, some of the variations of this *ababcc* stanza are interesting. In 1731, in *A Miscellany of Poems by Several Hands*, published at Oxford by J. Husbands, are three poems by an anonymous poet or poets, in which the sixth line is a septenary. These poems are fairly long, running 26, 19, and 19 stanzas.³ William Whitehead seems to have invented the formula *ababcc* in 1744, and

456

was followed by Vansittart, an anonymous "Hymen," and Anna Seward. In other stanzas also one occasionally finds a series of tetrameter lines concluded by a pentameter and an Alexandrine.

In its variations and imitations of Spenser's stanza, the seventeenth century had shown little fondness for the linking of the quatrains, and the eighteenth century for the most part followed the

¹ In 1818, Shelley, in his "Stanzas Written in Dejection," reduced the first eight lines to tetrameters; and in 1827, William and Mary Howitt, in their "Stanzas to Bernard Barton," reduced the first eight lines to trimeters.

² The only really extended poem in this stanza, that I know of, is Francis Hodgson's "The Friend, a Poem," 1818, which has 423 stanzas.

³ The only other instances of this stanza I have found are five poems by Oscar Wilde, written about 1880; they are all distinctly longer than the eighteenth-century poems, for "Panthea" has 30 stanzas, the "Garden of Eros" 46, "The Burden of Ilys" 58, "Humanidad" 73, and "Charmides" 101.

taste of the seventeenth. But toward the close of the eighteenth century, the vogue of the regular Spenserian stanza, assisted perhaps by the rapidly growing practice of the Italian sonnet, seems to have made it clear that the final Alexandrine was not the only element of charm in Spenser's stanza.

With this review of the principal poems both in the true stanza and in its most used imitations, we can turn to the various eighteenth-century criticisms of Spenser's stanza, to see how nearly use followed prescription. After Bysshe's comment of 1705, already quoted, came Prior's. In the Preface to his "Ode humbly address'd to the Queen; written in imitation of Spenser's Style," 1706, he said in part:

As to the Style, the Choice I made of following the Ode in Latin, determin'd me in English to the Stanza; and herein it was impossible not to have a Mind to follow our great Countryman SPENSER, which I have done (as well at least as I could) in the Manner of my Expression, and the Turn of my Number: Having only added one Verse to his Stanza, which I thought made the Number more Harmonious; and avoided such of his Words, as I found obsolete. I have however retain'd some few of them, to make the Colouring look more like Spenser's. Behest, Command; Band, Army; Prowess, Strength; I weet, I know; I ween, I think; whilom, heretofore; and Two or Three more of that Kind, which I hope the Ladies will Pardon me, and not judge my Muse less handsome, though for once she appears in a Farthingal. I have also in Spenser's Manner, used Caesar for Emperor, Boya for Bavaria, Bavar for that Prince, Ister for Danube, Iberia for Spain, &c. . . .

My two great Examples, HORACE and SPENSER, in many Things resemble each other: Both have a Height of Imagination, and a Majesty of Expression in describing the Sublime; and both know to temper those Talents, and sweeten the Description, so as to make it Lovely as well as Pompous: Both have equally that agreeable Manner of mixing Morality with their Story, and that Curiosa Felicitas in the Choice of their Diction, which every Writer aims at, and so very few have reach'd: Both are particularly fine in their Images and Knowing in their Numbers. . . .

Prior's criticism is both acute and sympathetic; it was no small matter, in 1706, for a prominent Classicist to link Horace and Spenser, and to pick out as their chief excellences "that Curiosa Felicitas in the Choice of their Diction, which every Writer aims at, and so very few have reach'd; Both are particularly fine in their Images, and Knowing in their Numbers." It is to be noted, too, that Prior

has no hint of condescension in his attitude toward Spenser. He does not enter into any explanation as to why he thought the extra line made "the Number more harmonious"; but we shall find that a chief objection to Spenser's stanza was the four lines rhyming together, which the independent quatrains avoided.

The next few passages, with some others in this chapter, are obviously so slight as to seem hardly worth quoting. They are all short, however, so that it seems best to give them, if only for the sake of completeness, and to show that some possible sources have not been overlooked. In February, 1707, Samuel Cobb referred to Prior's "Ode," in the Prefatory Discourse to his *Poems on Several Occasions*. Talking of the battle of Ramillies, he said:

There are several others on that Subject, and some will bear the Test; one particularly, written in imitation of the Style of Spenser; and goes under the name of Mr. Prior; I have not read it through, but *ex pede Herculem*. He is a gentleman who cannot write ill. Yet some of our criticks have fell upon it, as the Viper did on the File, to the Detriment of their Teeth.¹

In 1709 we get a faint allusion to Spenser in the Preface to John Reynolds' "Death, a Philosophical Poem," in which he asked:

Or has the Ruggedness and Antique Dress of Dr. Henry More's Philosophical Essays discourag'd others from attempting anything in the like kind?

In his third edition, in 1735, Reynolds changed his sentence to read:

Dr. H. More has attempted some Philosophical odes; but the antique dress and measures, that he has chosen, it is to be feared, have prejudiced his own, and discouraged others.

In 1709 also appeared "Licentia Poetica discuss'd: or, the true test of poetry," a poem, with preface and notes, by William Coward, M.D. In one passage Dr. Coward says:

Spencer, in this unfortunately Great,
New Schemes erected, old ones to defeat.
But, like *Miltonian Verse*, they pleased but few,
And those Perhaps, because the Schemes were New.

To these lines Coward appended this note:

It was fit I should name some Poem of this Nation, which is Spenser's "Fairy Queen," wrote in Imitation of the Old Latin Poets, with Hexameter

¹ Quoted from 3d ed., 1710.

and Pentameter Verses, which some in this present Age pretend to imitate. But the Grace of that Poem seems to consist more in the Design, than Curiosity of Rhyme, or Expressions.

In 1715, John Hughes prefixed to his edition of Spenser some "Remarks on the 'Faerie Queene'" in which he wrote:

As to the stanza in which the "Faerie Queene" is written, though the author cannot be commended in the choice of it, yet it is much more harmonious in its kind than the heroick verse of that age; it is almost the same with what the Italians call their *ottava rima*, which is used both by Ariosto and Tasso, but improved by Spenser, with the addition of a line more in the close, of the length of our Alexandrines. The defect of it in long or narrative poems is apparent; the same measure, closed always by a full stop, in the same place, by which every stanza is made as it were a distinct paragraph, grows tiresome by continual repetition, and frequently breaks the sense, when it ought to be carried on without interruption. With this exception the reader will, however, find it harmonious, full of well-sounding epithets, and of such elegant turns on the thought and words, that Dryden himself owned he learned these graces of verse chiefly from our author and does not scruple to say, that "in this particular, only Virgil surpassed him among the Romans, and only Mr. Waller among the English."

Obviously Hughes does very little more than echo Bysshe's comment of a few years earlier; even his mistaken explanation of where Spenser got his stanza might have been deduced from Bysshe. Hughes sent a copy of his "Remarks" to Pope, who wrote in acknowledgment:

Spenser has been ever a favorite poet to me; he is like a mistress whose faults we see, but love her with them all.¹

Years later, Spence, in his *Anecdotes*, records Pope as saying:

After my reading a Canto of Spenser two or three days ago to an old lady between seventy and eighty, she said that I had been showing her a collection of pictures. She said very right; and I know not how it is, but there is something in Spenser that pleases one as strongly in one's old age as it did in one's youth. I read the "Faerie Queene" when I was about twelve, with a vast deal of delight; and I think it gave me as much when I read it over about a year or two ago.²

These two statements, more than a quarter of a century apart and undoubtedly sincere, are of especial interest as coming from the most skilful wielder of the strict heroic couplet. Pope knew what

¹ Works, XI, 120.

² Ed. of 1820, pp. 86-87, 1743-44.

he could do best, in what direction his peculiar genius lay; but he showed himself none the less capable of enjoying work of a very different kind.

In 1718, in the Preface to "Solomon," a long poem in heroic couplets, Prior commented as follows on the difference between couplet and stanza:

I would say one word of the measure in which this, and most poems of this age are written. Heroic with continued rhyme, as Donne and his contemporaries used it, carrying the sense of one verse most commonly into another, was found too dissolute and wild, and came very often too near prose. As Davenant and Waller corrected, and Dryden perfected it; it is too confined: it cuts off the sense at the end of every first line which must always rhyme to the next following; and consequently produces too frequent an identity in the sound, and brings every couplet to the point of an epigram. It is indeed too broken and weak, to convey the sentiments and represent the images proper for Epic. And as it tires the writer while he composes, it must do the same to the reader while he repeats; especially in a poem of any considerable length.

If striking out into blank verse, as Milton did (and in this kind Mr. Philips, had he lived, would have excelled) or running the thought into Alternate or Stanza, which allows a greater variety, and still preserves the dignity of the verse, as Spenser and Fairfax have done; if either of these, I say, be a proper remedy for my poetical complaint, or if any other may be found, I dare not determine; I am only enquiring, in order to be better informed. . . . But once more: he that writes in rhimes, dances in fetters: and as his chain is more extended, he may certainly take longer steps.

By "heroic with continued rhyme" Prior meant what we usually call enjambed or run-on couplets. Theoretically, to "run on" couplets is to take a form admirably adapted to express concise, sententious, or witty ideas, and to ignore the primary function of the couplet rhyme; Prior saw this clearly, as he also saw that strict use "brings every couplet to the point of an epigram." But Prior had what seems to have been the peculiarly characteristic attitude of the early eighteenth century. An age of reason, reacting extremely from an age of, in literature at least, fantastic license, sought above all things for finality and authority. Charles II and his court had passed their exile in France at a time when French literature was in the hands of dogmatists who spoke with unlimited assumption of authority. At the Restoration Englishmen found in this authority more and more of a refuge. After so much turmoil, and in literature

so much metaphysical preciosity, solid, tangible, reasonable authority, especially when upheld by men of such force as Dryden, Addison, Swift, and Pope's circle, carried a weight that we, the inheritors of a century of Romanticism, can appreciate, or even understand, only with difficulty. Even the greater men deferred to authority, and bent their judgment to its decrees. But deference of judgment does not, except in the weak, result in suppression of tastes and likings. At most it colors one's phrasing, and obscures without obliterating. Some of the eighteenth-century writers were silent, either as being wholly in accord with the dogmas of the age, or as discreet conformists. Others, like Dr. Johnson, and Prior in the passages just quoted, spoke "under correction"; still others, especially in matters of taste rather than of reason, spoke apologetically. It is on record that Sir Walter Scott even was half ashamed of his fondness for folk-lore and ballads, until he chanced to hear that the Germans had taken up the subject seriously. The temptation is strong, therefore, to maintain that the witnesses I have to offer of Spenser's popularity in the eighteenth century are largely what the lawyers call "unwilling witnesses," who give evidence reluctantly, and whose testimony is therefore worth somewhat more than its face value. But it is surely not too much to point out that the increase in the reading public was great enough to make a market for many kinds of literature, and thus to encourage the writing of many kinds. Consequently the tendency which finally blossomed into the Romanticism of the first quarter of the eighteenth century had room in which to exist and grow alongside of Classicism. My main contention, which this history of the Spenserian stanza is designed to illustrate, is that, almost from the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Romantic tendency was never extinguished, or even suppressed, but was during the first half of the century only less prominent than the Classic spirit, and after 1750 received more and more open encouragement and recognition.

Between 1740 and 1750,¹ William Thompson, who has already

¹ Ralph Straus, in his bibliography of Dodsley's publications (*Robert Dodsley, Poet, Publisher, and Playwright*, 1910, p. 331) records Thompson's "Hymn to May" as published on April 28, 1746. The copy in the British Museum has the date trimmed off, and the Catalogue conjectures "1740?" The copy in the Bodleian is reported "n.d.," though whether or not the title-page is perfect, I do not know.

been mentioned, published a "Hymn to May" with a preface which began:

As Spenser is the most descriptive and florid of all our English writers, I attempted to imitate his manner, in the following vernal Poem. I have been very sparing of the antiquated words, which are too frequent in most of the imitations of this author; however, I have introduced a few here and there, which are explained at the bottom of each page where they occur. Shakespeare is the Poet of Nature, in adapting the affections and passions to his characters; and Spenser in describing her delightful scenes and rural beauties. His lines are most musically sweet; and his descriptions most delicately abundant, even to a wantonness of painting: but still it is the music and painting of Nature. We find no ambitious ornaments, or epigrammatical turns, in his writings, but a beautiful simplicity; which pleases far above the glitter of pointed wit. I endeavored to avoid the affectation of the one, without any hopes of attaining the graces of the other kind of writing. . . .

A modern writer has, I know, objected against running the verse into alternate and stanza: but Mr. Prior's authority is sufficient for me, who observes that it allows a greater variety, and still preserves the dignity of the verse. As I professed myself in this Canto to take Spenser for my model, I chose the stanza; which I think adds both a sweetness and solemnity at the same time to subjects of this rural and flowery nature. The most descriptive of our old Poets have always used it, from Chaucer down to Fairfax, and even long after him. I followed Fletcher's measure in his "Purple Island"; a poem, printed at Cambridge in 12 Cantos, in quarto, scarce heard of in this age, yet the best in the allegorical way (next to the "Fairy Queen"), in the English language. The Alexandrine line, I think, is peculiarly graceful at the end, and is an improvement on Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. . . .¹

Thompson possibly refers to Dr. Samuel Woodford, who, in the preface to his "Paraphrase upon the Canticles," 1679, says:

If therefore Ourselves or the French will use Blank Verse, either in an Heroick Poem, where they should be, I think, Couplets, as in Mr. Cowley's

¹ The "Purple Island" seems always to have found a few appreciative readers. Warton referred to it in his *Observations* of 1754, and in 1758, James Hervey wrote to a friend: "You some time ago sent me a poem, with which I was much delighted, notwithstanding the uncouth metre and obsolete words; I mean Fletcher's "Purple Island." . . . I wish any bookseller could be prevailed with to reprint the "Purple Island," and add to it "Christ's Victory," etc., in one neat volume. I believe it would sell, if properly revised and altered. . . . Had I been in perfect health . . . I question whether I should not have retouched the poetry, changed several of the obsolete words, illustrated the obscure passages by occasional notes, and run the risk of publishing the whole at my own expense." (Hervey's *Works*, Edinburgh, 1769, Letter CCVI, p. 696b.) Even Goldsmith quoted Fletcher approvingly. I do not know whether or not any of these men had anything to do with an ed. of Fletcher in 1789.

Davideis (for the Quadraints of Sir Wm. Davenant, and the Stanza of 9 in Spenser's "Fairy Queen," which are but an Improvement of the Ottava Rima, to instance in no more, seem not to me so proper), . . . let us give it the Character, as to its Form, which it anciently had. . . .

Here at least is objection to alternate and stanza, but if it is urged that an author of 1679 was not likely to be thought "modern" after 1740, let us turn to Edward Bysshe's *Art of Poetry*, 1702. He speaks of Chaucer's *Troilus*, Spenser's "Fairy Queen," and of the Italians, and adds:

But this is now wholly laid aside, and Davenant, who compos'd his Gondibert in Stanzas of 4 Verses in alternate Rhyme, was the last that follow'd their example of intermingling Rhymes in Heroick Poems.

Bysshe's statement sounds like a bungling echo of Woodford, and perhaps, as found in a popular treatise, would be likely to attract Thompson's attention. Professor Phelps (*Eng. Rom. Movement*, p. 59) thinks that the "modern writer" was Dr. Johnson, who criticized the Spenserians in *The Rambler* in May, 1751. But reference to Johnson's remarks (pp. 17 f. below) will show that he says nothing of objections to "alternate and stanza."

The first eighteenth-century writer to tell us at any length of his experience with Spenser was William Shenstone, who wrote to his friend Richard Graves as follows:

"THE DAY BEFORE CHRISTMAS," [1741?]

Some time ago, I read Spenser's "Fairy Queen"; and, when I had finished, thought it a proper time to make some additions and corrections, in my trifling imitation of him, the "School-mistress." His subject is certainly bad, and his action inexpressibly confused; but there are some particulars in him that charm one. Those which afford the greatest scope for a ludicrous imitation are, his simplicity and obsolete phrase; and yet these are what give one a very singular pleasure in the perusal. The burlesque which they occasion is of quite a different kind to that of Philips's "Shilling," Cotton's "Travestie," "Hudibras," or Swift's works; but I need not tell you this.

JANUARY 19, 1741-42

The true burlesque of Spenser (whose characteristic is simplicity) seems to consist in a *simple* representation of such things as one laughs to see or to observe one's self, rather than in any *monstrous* contrast betwixt the thoughts and words. I cannot help thinking that my added stanzas have more of his manner than what you saw before, which you are not a judge of, till you have read him.

JUNE, 1742

. . . . I am glad you are reading Spenser; though his plan is detestable, and his *invention* less wonderful than most people imagine, who do not much consider the obviousness of allegory; yet, I think, a person of your disposition must take great delight in his *simplicity*, his good-nature, &c. Did you observe a stanza that begins a canto somewhere, "Nought is there under heav'n's wide hollowness That breeds," &c.¹

When I bought him first, I read a page or two of the "Fairy Queen," and cared not to proceed. After that, Pope's "Alley" made me consider him ludicrously; and in that light, I think, one may read him with pleasure. I am now (as Ch——m——ley with ——), from trifling and laughing at him, really in love with him. I think even the metre pretty (though I shall never use it in earnest); and that the last Alexandrine has an extreme majesty. . . . Does not this line strike you (I do not justly remember what canto it is in); "Brave thoughts and noble deeds did *evermore* inspire." Perhaps it is my fancy only that is enchanted with the running of it.

[Undated, but ? 1742]

I dare say it must be incorrect; for I have added eight or ten stanzas within this fortnight. But inaccuracy is more excusable in ludicrous poetry than in any other. If it strikes *any*, it must be people of *taste*; for people of *wit* without taste (which comprehends the larger part of the critical tribe) be unavoidably despise it. I have been at some pains to secure myself from A. Philips's misfortune, of mere *childishness*, "little charm of placid mien," &c. I have added a ludicrous index, purely to shew (fools) that I am in jest: and my motto, "O qua sol habitabiles illustrat oras, maxime principum," is calculated for the same purpose. You cannot conceive how large the number is of those that mistake burlesque for the very foolishness it exposes (which observation I made once at the Rehearsal, at Tom Thumb, at Chrononhotonthologos; all which are pieces of elegant humour). I have some mind to pursue this caution further; and advertise it, "The School-mistress, &c." A very childish performance everybody knows (novorum more). But if a person seriously calls this, or rather, burlesque, a childish or low species of poetry, he says wrong. For the most regular and formal poetry may be called trifling, folly, and weakness, in comparison of what is written with a more *manly* spirit in ridicule of it.

NOVEMBER 22, 1745

I have read Spenser once again, and I have added full as much more to my "School-mistress," in regard to *number of lines*; *something* in point of *matter* (or *manner* rather) which does not displease me.

¹ I, III, 1; the second line reads, "That moves," etc.² IV, x, 26, line 9.

1746, "ineunte anno"

I thank you for your perusal of that trivial poem. If I were going to print it, I should give way to your remarks *implicitly*, and would not *dare* to do otherwise. But so long as I keep it in manuscript, you will pardon my silly prejudices if I chuse to read and shew it with the addition of most of my new stanzas. I own I have a fondness for several, imagining them to be *more* Spenser's way, yet more independent on the antique phrase, than any part of the poem; and, on that account, I cannot yet prevail on myself to banish *them* entirely; but were I to print, I should (with *some* reluctance) give way to your sentiments (which I know are just), namely, that they render the work too diffuse and flimzy, and seem rather excrescences than essential parts of it.¹

Professor Phelps has already called attention to the way in which Shenstone, drawn to Spenser by Pope's imitation, gradually came to change from parody to sincere imitation, though I think Professor Phelps has made rather more than is fair of Shenstone's reluctance to take himself or Spenser seriously. The passages given above (all but the last two are quoted by Professor Phelps) furnish another instance of the half-conscious struggle between an actual taste for what we now call Romantic things, and the deference due such autocratic oracles of "authority" as Pope. Robust, hearty John Dryden, at a time when pseudo-Classical dogma was growing more authoritative every day, went through this same struggle, and at the last leaned toward freedom. Thomas Gray living toward the close of pseudo-Classical dominance, also went through his struggles and his compromises. (Has it not often been remarked that the "Elegy" owes its unrivaled popularity to its blend of gently Romantic feeling and Classic expression?) Shenstone and a score of other writers—representative surely of a strong minority of the readers of that day—also wavered between the calls of taste and of authority, and often ended by admitting the rule of authority—but kept their likings.

In 1747, according to Nichols' *Literary Anecdotes*, I, 653 (ed. of 1812), Dr. Thomas Morell published "Spenser's *Works*, by subscription." Gordon Goodwin, in the *DNB*, records that "Morell is said to have issued by subscription an edition of Spenser's *Works*." Nichols' statement is positive and unhesitating, but I have thus far

¹ All of these citations are from Shenstone's *Letters*, 1769, pp. 61, 63, 66, 69, 120, and 121.

found no other hint of the existence of such an edition. In 1737, however, Morell edited Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, which by confusion may possibly have been the basis of Nichols' entry.

In April, 1748, James Thomson wrote to his friend Patterson: "After fourteen or fifteen years the 'Castle of Indolence' comes abroad in a fortnight." At the end of the poem Thomson added this "Advertisement":

This Poem being writ in the Manner of Spenser, the obsolete Words, and a Simplicity of Diction in some of the Lines, which borders on the Ludicrous, were necessary to make the Imitation more perfect. And the Stile of that admirable Poet, as well as the Measure in which he wrote, are as it were appropriated by Custom to all Allegorical Poems writ in our Language; just as in French the Stile of Marot who lived under Francis I has been used in Tales, and familiar Epistles, by the politest Writers of the Age of Louis XIV.

Both Shenstone and Thomson talk about the "ludicrous" effect of Spenser's diction; and yet both poets wrote perfectly serious, sympathetic poems, and Thomson succeeded better than anyone else, with the possible exceptions of Keats and Tennyson, in equaling Spenser on his own ground. This contradiction between their criticism and their practice seems to me to point inevitably to the conclusion that they were "unwilling witnesses," and that their critical vocabulary was already more hopelessly inadequate than they realized.¹ In November, 1748, Shenstone wrote to Jago:

Thomson's poem amused me greatly. . . . I think his plan has faults; particularly that he should have said nothing of the diseases attending laziness in his *first* canto, but reserved them to strike us more affectingly in the last, but on the whole, who would have thought that Thomson could have so well imitated a person remarkable for simplicity both of sentiment and phrase?²

In 1750, the Tonsons reissued John Hughes's edition of Spenser's *Works*. Hughes had died in 1720, so a "learned and anonymous author"³ furnished the "Remarks on Spenser's Poems" in the first volume. In March, 1751, Robert Lloyd published his "Progress of Envy," already referred to, and Gilbert West published the first

¹ An illuminating parallel is Byron; in the early stanzas of "Childe Harold" he imitates Spenser's diction, with ironic effect, but soon drops imitation and takes full advantage of the opportunities of the stanza for pictorial narration.

² *Letters*, 1769, p. 174.

³ See Upton's "Letter," and Warton's *Observations*.

(and only) canto of his poem on "Education" in the regular Spenserian stanza. In May, John Upton addressed to West a "Letter concerning a new edition of Spenser's *Fairy Queen*," in the course of which he said:

Whilst I am in this humour of finding fault, let me consider whether Spenser is altogether blameless for that foolish choice (shall I call it?) of his so frequent returning rhyme in a stanza of nine verses. What fetters for neither rhyme nor reason has he voluntarily put on? And many a bad spelling, many a lame thought and expression is he forced to introduce, merely for the sake of a jingling termination. Verse does not consist in that tinkling sound of similar endings, which was brought into Italy by Goths and Huns, but in proper measure and cadence, and both letters and words corresponding to the sense. Milton saw and avoided the rock which Spenser split on; in other respects, Spenser's imagination was greater.

In May also, Moses Mendez published his "Seasons. In Imitation of Spenser," and Dr. Samuel Johnson, in the *Rambler* for Tuesday, May 14, attacked the Spenserians. I quote his last three paragraphs:

There are, I think, two schemes of writing, on which the laborious wits of the present time employ their faculties. One is the adaptation of sense to all the rhymes which our language can supply to some word, that makes the burthen of the stanza; but this, as it has been only used in a kind of amorous burlesque, can scarcely be censured with much acrimony. The other is the imitation of Spenser, which, by the influence of some men of learning and genius, seems likely to gain upon the age, and therefore deserves to be more attentively considered.

To imitate the fictions and sentiments of Spenser can incur no reproach, for allegory is perhaps one of the most pleasing vehicles of instruction. But I am very far from extending the same respect to his diction or his stanza. His style was in his own time allowed to be vicious, so darkened with old words and peculiarities of phrase, and so remote from common use, that Johnson boldly pronounces him *to have written no language*. His stanza is at once difficult and displeasing; tiresome to the ear by its uniformity, and to the attention by its length. It was at first formed in imitation of the Italian poets, without due regard to the genius of our language. The Italians have little variety of termination, and were forced to contrive such a stanza as might admit the greatest number of similar rhymes; but our words end with so much diversity, that it is seldom convenient for us to bring more than two of the same sound together. If it be justly observed by Milton, that rhyme obliges poets to express their thoughts in improper terms, these improprieties must always be multiplied, as the difficulty of rhyme is increased by long concatenations.

The imitators of Spenser are indeed not very rigid censors of themselves, for they seem to conclude, that when they have disfigured their lines with a few obsolete syllables, they have accomplished their design, without considering that they ought not only to admit old words, but to avoid new. The laws of imitation are broken by every word introduced since the time of Spenser, as the character of Hector is violated by quoting Aristotle in the play. It would indeed be difficult to exclude from a long poem all modern phrases, though it is easy to sprinkle it with gleanings of antiquity. Perhaps, however, the style of Spenser might by long labor be justly copied; but life is surely given us for higher purposes than to gather what our ancestors have wisely thrown away, and to learn what is of no value, but because it has been forgotten.

Late in the year, Brindley published an edition of the *Fairy Queen* in three quarto volumes, with notes by Thomas Birch. Early in 1754 (Lowndes says wrongly 1752), Thomas Warton published his "Observations on the 'Fairy Queen' of Spenser" in which he deals at some length with Spenser's stanza and versification. In speaking of Spenser's "loathsome images," Warton says:

The truth is, the strength of our author's imagination could not be suppressed on any subject; and, in some measure, it is owing to the fulness of his stanza, and the reiteration of his rhymes, that he described these offensive objects so minutely.¹

In Section IV, "Of Spenser's Stanza, Versification, and Language," he said:

Although Spenser's favourite Chaucer had made use of the *ottava rima*, or stanza of eight lines; yet it seems probable that Spenser was principally induced to adopt it, with the addition of one line, from the practice of Ariosto and Tasso, the most fashionable poets of his age. But Spenser, in chusing this stanza, did not sufficiently consider the genius of the English language, which does not easily fall into a frequent repetition of the same termination; a circumstance natural to the Italian, which deals largely in identical cadences.

Besides, it is to be remembered, that Tasso and Ariosto did not embarrass themselves with the necessity of finding out so many similar terminations as Spenser. Their *ottava rima* has only three similar endings, alternately rhyming. The two last lines formed a distinct rhyme. But in Spenser, the second rhyme is repeated four times, and the third three.

This constraint led our author into many absurdities; the most striking and obvious of which seem to be the following.

¹ Ed. of 1807, I, 97.

I. It obliged him to dilate the thing to be expressed, however unimportant, with trifling and tedious circumlocutions, viz.:

Now hath fair Phoebe, with her silver face,
Thrice seen the shadows of this nether world,
Sith last I left that honourable place,
In which her royal presence is enroll'd. 2.3.44.

That is, "it is three months since I left her palace."

II. It necessitated him, when matter failed towards the close of a stanza, to run into a ridiculous redundancy and repetition of words, viz.:

In which was nothing pourtrahed nor wrought,
Nor wrought nor pourtrahed, but easie to be thought. 2.9.33.

III. It forced him, that he might make out his complement of rhymes to introduce a puerile or impertinent idea, viz.:

Not that proud towre of Troy, though richly *gilt*. 2.9.45.

Being here laid under the compulsion of producing a consonant word to *spilt* and *built*, which are preceding rhymes, he has mechanically given us an image at once little and improper.

To the difficulty of a stanza so injudiciously chosen, I think we may properly impute the great number of his ellipses, some of which will be pointed out at large in another place; and it may be easily conceived, how that constraint which occasioned superfluity, should at the same time be the cause of omission.

Notwithstanding these inconveniencies flow from Spenser's measure, it must yet be owned, that some advantages arise from it; and we may venture to affirm, that the fullness and significancy of Spenser's descriptions is often owing to the prolixity of his stanza, and the multitude of his rhymes. . . . The discerning reader is desired to consider the following stanza, as an instance of what is here advanced. Guyon is binding Furor.

With hundred iron chains he did him bind
And hundred knots, which did him sore constraîne;
Yet his great iron teeth he still did grind,
And grimly gnash, threatening revenge in vaine:
His burning eyen, whom bloudie strakes did staine,
Stared full wide, and threw forth sparks of fire;
And more for ranke despight, than for great paine,
Shakt his long locks colour'd like copper wire,
And bit his tawny beard to shew his raging ire. 2.4.15.

In the subsequent stanza there are some images, which perhaps were produced by a multiplicity of rhymes.

He all that night, that too long night did passe,
And now the day out of the ocean-maine
Began to peep above this earthly masse,

With pearly dew sprinkling the morning grasse;
 Then up he rose like heavy lump of leade,
 That in his face, as in a looking-glasse,
 The signs of anguish one might plainly reade. 3.5.26.

It is indeed surprising, upon the whole, that Spenser should execute a poem of uncommon length, with so much spirit and ease, laden as he was with so many shackles, and embarrassed with so complicated a *bondage of riming*. Nor can I recollect, that he has been so careless as to suffer the same word to be repeated as a rhyme to itself, in more than four or five instances; a fault which, if he had more frequently committed, his manifold beauties of versification would have obliged us to overlook. . . .

Like Dr. Johnson and too many others, Warton is here arguing chiefly *a priori*. His fault-finding might be appropriate enough if he were dealing with Popean couplets. His praise of Spenser, too, which really hits upon Spenser's peculiar excellences, is obscured by his half-apologetic, timid manner. Appreciation is there, but the possibility of there being two equally admirable but sharply contrasted kinds of writing is only half suspected.

In 1755, in the *Connoisseur* for May 8 (No. 67), Robert Lloyd, who had himself in 1751 perverted Spenser's stanza, turned his ridicule rather cleverly upon the imitators in the following lines:

Others, who aim at fancy, choose
 To woo the gentle Spenser's muse.
 The poet fixes for his theme
 An allegory, or a dream.
 Fiction and truth together joins
 Thro' a long waste of flimsy lines;
 Fondly believes his fancy glows,
 And image upon image grows;
 Thinks his strong Muse takes wondrous flights,
 Whene'er she sings of peerless wights,
 Of dens, of palfreys, spells, and knights,
 'Till allegory, Spenser's veil,
 T' instruct and please in moral tale,
 With him 's no veil the truth to shroud,
 But one impenetrable cloud.

In this same year, Cornelius Arnold prefaced his satire, "The Mirror; in the manner of Spenser," with the statement that:

He thinks he need not make any Apology for the Stile and Measure of the Verse, they being generally, if not universally allowed, the most suitable for works of this kind.

When Arnold republished the "Mirror" in his *Poems on Several Occasions* two years later, he expanded his apology to read, in the phrases of his predecessors:

The Author begs leave to premise, that in this Essay he has retained some few of the old Words of Spenser, and adopted the Simplicity of the Diction in the ludicrous Cast, at the end of most of the Stanzas, to give it somewhat the exterior Air of that great Original, however far short he may have fell of the Spirit.

In May, 1756, William Huggins, who had translated Ariosto and Dante, irritated at the ignorance of Italian which he thought Warton showed in his *Observations*, published the "Observer Observ'd or Remarks on Observations on the 'Faïere Queene' of Spenser by T. Warton." He devoted himself chiefly to criticisms of Warton's Italian parallels, and had very little to say about Spenser.

Late in 1758, the Tonsons, who had published Hughes's edition of Spenser's *Works*, issued an edition of the "Fairy Queen" in two quarto volumes, edited by John Upton. (Lowndes, in addition to this edition, records one published by Tonson in two volumes octavo, but I know of no other mention of such an edition.) In the same year William Faden published an edition of the "Fairy Queen" in four volumes octavo, by Ralph Church. Both of these editions were noticed by the *Critical Review* in 1759: *Upton's* in September in half a page of high praise; *Church's* in February by Goldsmith, who calls Spenser "our old favorite," and quotes approvingly three stanzas from Phineas Fletcher, but says nothing of Spenser's stanza. In 1759 also there appeared "An Impartial Estimate of Mr. Upton's Notes on the 'Fairy Queen,'" which the *Gentleman's Magazine* noticed in April, and again in May. This essay is chiefly devoted to charging Upton with unacknowledged borrowings from Warton's *Observations*.

The close relation between the various manifestations of Romanticism showed itself in 1761 in a translation of Macpherson's "Fragment XIII": "Collect the earth and pile the stones on high," into the pseudo-Spenserian ten-line stanza. In 1782, Andrew Macdonald, apparently influenced both by Beattie's "Minstrel" (as the *Critical Review* for March, 1783, pointed out) and by Ossian, published two poems in the regular stanza, "Minvela" in 19 stanzas, and "Velina"

in 99 stanzas, both called "Fragments." Macpherson's *Ossian* and Gray's *Northern Odes* were signs of the trend of interest, and undoubtedly helped to make the amazing popularity of Percy's *Reliques*. Beattie's "Minstrel," a poem on a northern theme written in the Spenserian stanza, furnishes another instance of how the various streams of Romanticism mingled their currents. While Professor Beers is right in pointing out¹ that there was no organized propaganda of Romanticism (there rarely has been such a thing in the history of English literature—the pre-Raphaelites are almost unique), he seems to me wrong in his implication that the indications of the change were sporadic and unconnected, for where we find one man who shows interest in only one phase of the Romantic revival, we find three who are concerned with two or more phases. Among a host I may cite James Thomson, accurate describer of nature, writer of blank verse and of Spenserian stanzas; William Shenstone, Spenserian, and chief councilor of Dodsley's *Collection* and Percy's *Reliques*; Thomas Edwards, Shaksperian, Spenserian, and sonneteer; William Julius Mickle, balladist, sonneteer, and Spenserian.

As has already been said, the eighteenth century as well as the seventeenth seemed chiefly impressed by the allegory of the "Fairy Queen"; and this allegory, because it is both elusive and contradictory, seemed out of keeping with the eighteenth century's rather formal ideas of what an epic should be. Elizabeth Cooper, in the *Muses Library*, 1737, I, 255, blamed Ariosto, for she wrote:

Had he [Spenser] never debauch'd his Taste with the Extravagancies of Ariosto, He might have vied in Fame (if we may judge by Translations) with the most venerated of the Antients, and deterr'd the most ingenious Moderns from hoping to equal Him.

A reviewer in the *Monthly Review* for January, 1762, in a notice of Macpherson's *Fingal*, had something of the same notion, for he took occasion to say:

We should, for our own part, almost as soon rank Spenser's "Fairy Queen" among the epic poems, as the celebrated allegorical performance of Ariosto.

Perhaps both of these go back to Dryden's comments that "Ariosto's style is luxurious, without majesty or decency," and that "Tasso

¹ *English Romanticism, Eighteenth Century*, pp. 422-23.

confesses himself too lyrical . . . beneath the dignity of heroic verse."¹

In 1767, William Julius Mickle, the translator of the *Lusiads* published anonymously a poem of 136 Spenserian stanzas, called "The Concubine." To a second edition in 1769, he prefixed an "Advertisement" which began: "When this poem was first offered to the public, it was not accompanied with any prefatory address." The last paragraph ran:

Some reasons, perhaps, may be expected for having adopted the manner of Spenser. To propose a general use of it were indeed highly absurd; yet it may be presumed there are some subjects on which it may be used with advantage. But not to enter upon any formal defence, the Author will only say, that the fulness and wantonness of description, the quaint simplicity, and, above all, the ludicrous, of which the antique phraseology and manner of Spenser are so happily and peculiarly susceptible, inclined him to esteem it not solely as the best, but the only mode of composition adapted to his subject.

This advertisement was slightly changed in an edition of 1771, and still further in 1777, when the poem was published with Mickle's name as "Sir Martyn, a Poem in the Manner of Spenser," with the statement that "this attempt in the Manner of Spenser was first published in 1767, since which time it has passed through some editions under the title of the 'Concubine.'" Mickle, to be sure, has nothing new to say; he clings as his predecessors did to the "ludicrous"; but his references to "the fulness and wantonness of description" and "the quaint simplicity" of Spenser sound less like apology and more like the open praise we are to hear from Beattie.

Thomas Chatterton, however important he may be as a Romanticist, is surprisingly like Spenser's disciples of the first quarter of the seventeenth century, in that he experimented with a final Alexandrine in a number of stanza-forms, without once using Spenser's own stanza. The most of his seven imitative stanzas are mere uses of forms familiar to both the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—the *ababcc*, the rhyme-royal,² and Prior's

¹ "Essay on Satire," 1693, *Scott-Saintsb.*, XIII, 15.

² Professor Saintsbury, in his *English Prosody*, II, 523, characteristically remarks that Chatterton's "Ballad of Charity" "is the first resurrection for many a day of rhyme-royal with an Alexandrine ending." In January, 1737, the *Gentleman's Magazine* printed two poems in this stanza, "The Country Parson," and "The Country Curate"; the first of these was reprinted in Dodsley's *Collection* in 1758, and in *A Select Collection*

stanza. The total number of stanzas, of various rhyme-schemes, which Chatterton ended with an Alexandrine, number only 259. However, 189, or about three-fourths of these, are in a stanza of Chatterton's own devising, which runs *ababbcbddd*. Chatterton has kept the linked quatrains, and has merely substituted for Spenser's ninth line a couplet on a new rhyme—a scheme which is half-way between Spenser's stanza and Prior's. Chatterton has not had followers in the use of this stanza, so far as I know, but, though he doubtless invented it for himself, Alexander Scott had used the rhyme-scheme before 1568, William Browne of Tavistock had used it in 1614 in nine stanzas of the fifth eclogue of "The Shepherd's Pipe," and William Lisle, in 1628, wrote a stanza which is Chatterton's exactly.

In September, 1766, Beattie wrote to Dr. Blacklock:

Not long ago I began a poem in the style and stanza of Spenser, in which I propose to give full scope to my inclination, and be either droll or pathetic, descriptive or sentimental, tender or satirical, as the humor strikes me; for, if I mistake not, the manner which I have adopted admits equally of all these kinds of composition. I have written 150 lines, and am surprised to find the structure of that complicated stanza so little troublesome. I was always fond of it, for I think it the most harmonious that ever was contrived. It admits of more variety of pause than either the couplet or the alternate rhyme; and it concludes with a pomp and majesty of sound, which, to my ear, is wonderfully delightful. It seems also very well adapted to the genius of our language, which, from its irregularity of inflection and number of monosyllables, abounds in diversified terminations, and, consequently renders our poetry susceptible of an endless variety of legitimate rhymes.

When the first book of the "Minstrel" finally appeared, in 1771, Beattie rephrased some of his ideas in his "Preface":

I have endeavoured to imitate Spenser in the measure of his verse, and in the harmony, simplicity, and variety of his composition. Antique expressions I have avoided; admitting, however, some old words, where they seemed to suit the subject: but I hope none will be found that are now obsolete, or in any degree not intelligible to a reader of English poetry.

To those, who may be disposed to ask, what could induce me to write in so difficult a measure, I can only answer, that it pleases my ear, and

of *Poems* at Edinburgh, in 1768; the second was reprinted as "by Mr. T." in the *London Magazine* for January, 1760. In 1746, Thomas Blacklock's "An Hymn to Divine Love, an imitation of Spenser" appeared in his *Poems on Several Occasions*, at Glasgow.

seems, from its Gothic structure and original, to bear some relation to the subject and spirit of the Poem. It admits both simplicity and magnificence of sound and of language, beyond any other stanza that I am acquainted with. It allows the sententiousness of the couplet, as well as the more complex modulation of blank verse. What some critics have remarked of its uniformity growing at last tiresome to the ear, will be found to hold true, only when the poetry is in other respects faulty.

The *Gentleman's Magazine* promptly reviewed the "Minstrel" in May, and with a reviewer's disregard of the author's preface, made the very criticisms which Beattie had tried to forestall. The following are the only points of consequence:

The author has chosen to write in the stanza which Spenser imitated from the Italian, for which every reader of unvitiated taste will certainly be sorry.

An ear not used to the stanza of Spenser is rather disappointed than gratified by the rhyme; and to him that has read it long enough to expect the rhyme, it can scarce fail to have become tiresome. . . . the tedious Alexandrine which constantly ends the song, "And like a wounded snake drags its slow length along."

Our author however, has been content to recur to the rudiments of our versification, without recurring also, as many others have done, to the rudiments of our language, he has used neither antiquated dialect nor obsolete terms, and the melody of his verses, taken separately, almost atones for the barbarous dissonance of his stanza.

One significant item in Beattie's preface is his claim for the Spenserian stanza of the "complex modulation of blank verse." At least after 1700, blank verse had never been in total eclipse, as many have believed, but had merely been overshadowed. Throughout the first half of the century, and long before Thomson's *Seasons* or Young's *Night Thoughts*, blank verse had been constantly used for the serious expression of lofty ideas. The influence of Milton grew constantly greater, and appreciation of his verse led to a fondness for his "modulations," which helped materially in encouraging poets to try verse-forms other than the couplet—in particular, the Spenserian stanza and the sonnet. The steadily increasing practice of the sonnet after 1750—and the revival of the sonnet owed more to Milton than to any other ten men—was based as much as on anything else upon the fact that the sonnet offered an escape from the couplet, and, in the Miltonian sonnet especially, allowed and

in part depended upon varied pauses. The eighteenth-century couplet was as rigid a verse-form as England had ever known; the heroic, or elegiac, quatrain did not escape from the tyranny of rather narrow limits; and the anapestic measures so common in the lighter verse of the day seemed obviously to lack dignity. Consequently, the flourishing of blank verse, of the sonnet, and of the roomy, adaptable Spenserian stanza, might, it seems, have been clearly foreseen. As a matter of fact, it was not foreseen, and until recently it has been recognized only grudgingly and imperfectly.

In 1775 an anonymous writer published at Bristol "Clifton, in imitation of Spenser," with a preface in which he remarked:

. . . . I imitate Spenser whose works are now but seldom read. . . . The quaintness of his expression, the obsolescence of his terms and the frequent recurrence of his rhymes are very general objections to one of the greatest poets who ever lived . . . a thought occurred to me in a pensive walk, and occurred to me in the Stanza of Spenser.

His statement that Spenser's "works are now but seldom read" is not to be taken too seriously; what with an edition in 1750, another of the "Fairy Queen" in 1751, and two in 1758, and the numerous imitations of his stanza (which would surely send some readers to the original), Spenser must have been read fairly often. At least since the days of Horace and Juvenal it has been a literary commonplace to bewail "the degeneracy of modern taste."

The debate about Spenser gradually shifted from his language and his rhymes to the more general question of the use of stanza for long narrative poems. This shifting of the field shows clearly in the *Gentleman's Magazine's* review of a second edition of Hugh Downman's "Land of the Muses," a poem in the Spenserian stanza first published in 1767. A comparison of this review (in March, 1791) with that of the "Minstrel" in 1771, makes it evident that the *Gentleman's Magazine* had changed either its reviewer or its ideas:

[The "Land of the Muses" is] commonly spoken of in terms of high approbation. We say *commonly*, because there were some, and those people of acknowledged taste, who objected to the obsolete phraseology of Spenser, in imitation of whom it was written. . . . Whether, however, that obsolete style, and the *octave rhyme* are not better adapted to scenes where Fancy ranges unrestrained, to magic charms, and those ideal beings who people the land of Allegory, and "float in light vision 'round the poet's head"

may admit of some doubt. We own a predilection for those numbers which Spenser so happily adopted, and which possibly may arise merely from his having so successfully used them.

My last quotation for the eighteenth century also questions the use of stanza. In 1795, William Roscoe, in his *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (I, 279, n. 682, l. 12), wrote:

Notwithstanding those illustrious authorities [Ariosto and Tasso], it may perhaps be allowable to doubt, whether a series of stanzas be the most eligible mode of narrating an epic, or indeed any other extensive kind of poem. That it is not natural, must be admitted; for naturally we do not apportion the expression of our sentiments into equal divisions; and that which is not natural, cannot in general long be pleasing. Hence the works of Ariosto, of Tasso, and of Spenser, labour under a disadvantage which it requires all the vigour of genius to surmount and this is the more to be regretted, as both the Italian and the English languages admit of compositions in blank verse, productive of every variety of harmony.

In much reading of minor poets, I have found those of the seventeenth century rather more constantly interesting and various than those of the eighteenth; perhaps the reason is that in the seventeenth century the English muse was more often lyrical. In the eighteenth century the prevalence of the couplet meant more logic, more intellect untouched by deep feeling; and yet the eighteenth century's devotion to Spenser was more constant, more fruitful, and found a more responsive audience than before. It is perhaps remarkable that in 1648, at the height of the Puritan movement, Robert Herrick should have published his wonderful lyrics, and that they should have gone almost without comment for more than a hundred years. But it is surely much more remarkable that in 1748, the "Castle of Indolence"—the most Spenserian poem between Spenser and Keats—should have appeared at the height of Pope's influence, and should have been eagerly read and admired. Herrick fell on evil times, as one may easily see, and Thomson ought also, so far as a-priori conjecture goes, to have found his readers in later generations than his own. That Thomson was immediately liked is the best evidence that the influence of Pope and Johnson was not overwhelming.

EDWARD PAYSON MORTON

CHICAGO, ILL.

STAGE DECORATION AND THE UNITY OF PLACE IN FRANCE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

The simultaneous stage setting of the Middle Ages, with its freedom in regard to the number and situation of scenes, which was in vogue in Paris in the early years of the seventeenth century, was in direct opposition to the rule of the unity of place. The Middle Ages and classicism were at swords' points. Practice was arrayed against theory. When Corneille began to produce plays, he accepted the time-honored system of stage decoration; and, as he said, he followed Hardy and common-sense. There is little reason for believing that the appearance of the stage of the Hôtel de Bourgogne had changed at any time from the moment the Confrérie de la Passion took possession of it until at least 1637. Bapst is of the opinion that this theater had stage settings as long as the Confrérie had the management of it; but that from 1578, when other troupes rented it, no real scenery was set until Hardy's comedians began to play on its stage.¹ He argues that these comedians, who rented it from 1578 on, were nomadic; and he asks what they could do on their journeys with scenes at all large. Yet Scarron describes how the later wandering troupes carried scenery on their carts; and it must be remembered that it was almost invariably the practice of the professional drama to employ scenery, although the literary drama of the Renaissance may not have been produced with stage setting.² However, even in the representations of plays in colleges, scenery was improvised, if we may take as evidence the passage in Sorel's *Francion* in which he describes such a stage as follows: "Jamais vous ne vîtes rien de si mal ordonné que notre théâtre. Pour représenter une fontaine, on avait mis celle de la cuisine, sans la cacher de toile ni de branches, et l'on avait attaché les arbres au ciel parmi les nues."³

It is hard to believe that the custom of setting the stage suddenly died out for a quarter of a century at the Hôtel de Bourgogne only to

¹ Bapst, *Essai sur l'histoire du théâtre*, Paris, 1893, p. 148.

² Scarron, *Le roman comique*, p. 1.

³ Sorel, *Histoire comique de Francion*, 1856, p. 140.

be revived by the troupe to which Hardy was attached. Even if the players of this period did not own scenery, what of that which belonged to the Hôtel de Bourgogne up to 1578? Surely it was not destroyed. It is natural to suppose that such settings were considered an asset, an important part of the theater, and were rented by those troupes which played at the Hôtel de Bourgogne from 1578 to 1599. The professional drama of the period would be practically unintelligible without the aid of scenery; and we are not to conjecture that the plays given from 1578 to the beginning of the seventeenth century in the Paris theater belonged to the scholastic drama of the followers of the Pléiade.

[An important source of information concerning stage decoration in France in the second third of the seventeenth century is the *Mémoire* of Mahelot and Laurent.¹ This document, consisting of 94 folios, is entitled: *Mémoire de plusieurs décorations qui serve (sic) aux pièces contenues en ce présent livre, commencé par Laurent Mahelot et continué par Michel Laurent en l'année 1673*. Nothing certain is known of Mahelot and Laurent; but it is generally supposed that they were stage carpenters of the Hôtel de Bourgogne at different periods.² Mahelot could not have begun the *Mémoire* before 1633, since the second play whose setting it records is not anterior to that date. The handwriting changes for the first time on folio 81, and all the decorations described up to that point belong to plays produced before or during the year 1636, or possibly one produced in 1637, namely *Le berger fidelle*. Beauchamps cites six plays of this name, and Dacier suggests that the pastoral dated 1637 is the play whose setting is given.³ The last description recorded in the first handwriting is that of *Iphis et Iante*, by Benserade, which was represented in 1636. The next description in the new handwriting is the setting of *Suréna*, produced in 1674. [Thus the second part of the *Mémoire* could not have been begun before 1674; and the date 1673, given by the manuscript itself as the year in which Laurent continued the work of Mahelot, is slightly inaccurate. The first thing which Laurent did in taking up this task was to indicate the scenery for Corneille's plays produced after 1636, including the *Cid*. Therefore,

¹ Dacier, *La mise-en-scène à Paris au XVII^e siècle. Mémoire de Laurent Mahelot et Michel Laurent*. (Extrait des *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France*, Vol. XXVIII.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 107.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

it seems that Mahelot had ceased to keep his record about the time that the *Cid* was given, for he does not describe the setting of any play produced after 1637. Had he kept up the *Mémoire*, we should have found the descriptions of Corneille's plays in his handwriting. It is evidently to supply this lacuna that Laurent begins in 1674 to bring the manuscript up to date. Thus about thirty-seven years pass between the work of Mahelot and that of Laurent.

The mémoranda of the first part of the *Mémoire* are sufficient proof that the simultaneous stage setting was the rule until at least 1637. Even Corneille's *Illusion comique* (1636) requires a multiple setting consisting of a palace in the center of the stage; on one side, a cave in a mountain; and on the other side, a park. A slight modification of this system could be made by setting a scene only in some particular act, as in Mairet's *Criséide et Arimante*, in which the "tomb and the altar appear only in the fifth act," according to Mahelot's memorandum. Also in *Les galanteries du duc d'Ossone* by Mairet there is found a procedure which may have been the beginning of the new method of changing the scene. In the second act the stage direction says: "Comme il est entré, la toile se tire qui représente la façade d'une maison, et le dedans du cabinet paroist." A second room is also disclosed in the same scene, as is shown by the direction: "Icy la seconde toile se tire, et Flavie paroist sur son liet." These two scenes, being placed side by side for dramatic purposes, form a simultaneous setting. In the next act the setting changes back to the original scene, for the direction reads: "Icy les deux toiles se ferment et Emilie paroist dans la rue." Such a procedure is not new on the French stage, for curtains were drawn on the mediaeval stage in order to hide such an event as the birth of a child; but in this play the curtain is used to disclose a new scene and this indicates the beginning of a new method of stage setting.

Another instance in which these two methods were combined is mentioned by d'Aubignac in regard to a performance of *Pirame et Thisbé*. In this case the wall which separated the two lovers was made to disappear in order that the actors might see each other, and in order to allow the space on each side of the wall to represent the two rooms of the hero and heroine.¹

¹ D'Aubignac, *La pratique du théâtre*, Amsterdam, 1715, Vol. I, p. 92.

Yet in spite of these possible modifications and exceptions, it does not seem to have been the regular practice to change scenery after the opening of a play; and one is inclined to question Danheisser's¹ theory that if the settings did not have to be changed at the beginning of each act, the author had observed a certain unity called the *unité de scène* in contradistinction to the later *unité de lieu*. It was quite possible to set at the same time two scenes representing places as far distant as the proverbial Rome and Constantinople, and the two scenes would not necessarily change during the whole play. This setting would not constitute any *unité de scène*; and if there is any distinction to be drawn between the two terms, it is rather that the *unité de scène* was observed in Mairet's *Silvanire*, where the different places represented are not far apart, although it is doubtful if any difference in meaning between the expressions can be pointed out.

Scudéry implies that the *Cid* was produced with a simultaneous setting, as were all the contemporary plays mentioned in the first part of the *Mémoire*. He says in his *Observations* that the same place represented the apartment of the king, that of the infants, the house of Chimène, and the street, *presque sans changer de face*. The setting for the *Cid* is noted by Laurent in the second part of the *Mémoire* as *une chambre à quatre portes*; but this may well be a later setting, employed in order to conform more closely to the rule of the unity of place. Evidence in favor of this theory as to the changes in the setting, is found in the fact that the setting of Theophile's *Pirame et Thisbé* underwent a similar reduction in the number of scenes. It had been produced originally with the decoration noted by Mahelot as follows: "Il faut au milieu du théâtre un mur de marbre et de pierre fermé; des ballustres; il faut aussi de chaque costé deux ou trois marches pour monter. A un des costez du théâtre, un murier, un tombeau entouré de pyramides." When the play was revived in 1682, Laurent records the setting as consisting of the vague *palais à volonté*. However, vague and indefinite scenery, which finally became the rule, was strongly criticized at this period. Scudéry objects that the setting of the *Cid* is so inexact

¹ Danheisser, "Zur Geschichte der Einheiten in Frankreich," *Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur*, XIV (1892), 48.

that the audience does not always know where the actors are supposed to be. He says in his preface to his *Didon* that it is necessary to please the people sometimes by the diversity of spectacles and by the different faces of the scenery. Rayssiguier expresses the same idea in the preface to his *Aminte*, in which he says that audiences wish to have their eyes pleased by *la diversité et changement de la face du théâtre*. Sarrazin complains in the preface to Scudéry's *Amour tyrannique* that the successors of Hardy have made an ambulatory stage, and that one does not know whether the actors are talking in their houses or in the streets. Corneille will later find the vague, single setting a means of concealing violations of the unity of place; but he wrote the *Cid*, as he did all his early plays, for a stage which was to be decorated with simultaneous settings.

After the production of the *Cid*, the dramatists were confronted on the one hand by the system of simultaneous stage decoration, which could be slightly modified by certain changes of scene, and, on the other hand, by the rule of the unity of place. The question was how to reconcile practice with theory. As has been shown, the public then, as always, enjoyed the element of spectacle in drama; and it was difficult to construct plots which would not demand a change of scene in order to be understood. Scudéry, in his *Mort de César*, avoided a palpable change of place by having the stage set with communicating rooms which remained hidden until the action was passing within them.¹ In the preface to *Proserpine*, a play in which the action takes place "au Ciel, en Sicile, et aux Enfers," Claveret makes the amusing statement that the reader can imagine a certain unity of place by conceiving it as a perpendicular line drawn from heaven to Hades. To such an extent was he ready to sacrifice reason for a rule supposed to be founded on reason.²

It is probable that *Cinna*, like the *Cid*, was produced at first with the usual simultaneous setting. The direction given by Laurent for this play, *le théâtre est un palais*, means that the drama came to be produced later with one scene; but Corneille implies that there were other scenes at first, when he advises in his *Discours* that the place should not change during an act but in the intermissions, "as happens

¹ Rigal, *Le théâtre français avant la période classique*, Paris, 1901, p. 290.

² Arnaud, *Étude sur la vie et les œuvres de l'abbé d'Aubignac*, Paris, 1888, p. 147.

in the first three of *Cinna*," and that these different places should not have different scenery. The fact that in 1660 Corneille was opposed to marking different scenes is strong evidence that scenery was quite in vogue up to that time.

La Mesnardière in his *Poétique*, published in 1640, is very liberal in his interpretation of the unity of place in its relation to scenery. In speaking of "asides" he says:

Je n'ignore pas les Raisons qu'allèguent les Poètes modernes pour excuser cette erreur. Je sçai qu'ils disent que la Scène étant vn lieu vaste et ample, par exemple, de l'étenduë de la ville de Paris, l'vn des endroits du Théastre peut représenter le Louure et l'autre la Place Royale; et partant qu'il faut supposer qu'encore que l'vn des Acteurs parle en la présence d'vn autre, celui qui est dans le Louure ne peut toutefois entendre ce que son Compagnon prononce dans vn cartier éloigné, comme dans la Place Royale. . . . Nous permettons aux Dramatiques d'étendre en ces occasions les bornes de leur Théastre et de partager leur Scène en plusieurs cartiers différens, pourveu qu'ils y fassent écrire, *Cet endroit figure le Louure, et Cy est la Place Royale*.¹

There is no evidence that this suggestion in regard to the signs was carried out at this date, although they had been used in the Middle Ages, in at least one case, at Rouen in 1474. D'Aubignac says that the first time he read this passage he thought that La Mesnardière was joking in advocating such a procedure.² We naturally wonder whether La Mesnardière knew of the signs used on the English stage.

La Mesnardière, as late as 1640, is still advocating the old system which had come down from the Middle Ages, for, as he says, since the stage generally represents a whole city, often a small country, and sometimes a house, it must show as many scenes as it marks different places. It must not present a garden or a forest for the scene of an action which has happened in a palace; and even in this palace, the stage should not show anything happening in the apartment of the king which should take place in the queen's apartment. If the event has happened on the sea-shore, the stage must show a marine scene in one of its façades in order that the action may not be misunderstood. The whole stage should be arranged as follows:

¹ La Mesnardière, *La poétique*, Paris, 1640, p. 269.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 239.

Si l'Auanture s'est passée moitié dans le Palais d'un Roy en plusieurs appartemens, et moitié hors de la Maison en beaucoup d'endroits différens; il faut que le grand du Théâtre, le προσκήνιον des Grecs, ie veux dire *cette largeur qui limite le parterre* serue pour tous les dehors où ces choses ont été faites, et que les Renfondremens soient divisez en plusieurs Chambres, par les diuers Frontispieces, Portaux, Colonnes, ou Arcades.¹

Such a stage differs not at all from the setting of the mediaeval stage. It has been believed that scenery ceased to be a matter of importance after the production of the *Cid*; but stage setting is still so important that La Mesnardière even describes how certain single scenes should be constructed. The prison scene—one which dates back centuries in its use—should be mounted so that the prisoner could be contained within and not be allowed to leave its limits. The eyes of the spectator should be able to penetrate its depths, and the darkness and obscurity lit up by a sombre light would make the prison more frightful.² Mahelot directs that the prison in Du Ryer's *Clitophon* be set with a large, low, barred opening so that three prisoners may be seen. According to La Mesnardière the same arrangement applies to cave scenes. Their mouths must open on the stage like a door; and if the cave is supposed to be closed, the interior must be made visible by means of a barred opening. Thus the dark cavern will seem more cruel in proportion as it is more closed, darker, and more horrible.

La Mesnardière objects to the custom of re-using scenery which grew up on account of the indigence of the comedians. Each play, he claims, should have its own scenery, and Rome should not be turned into Constantinople and Libya into Norway. He, too, was against the inexactness of stage decoration, and he says it is a mistake to represent what happened in the room of a king as taking place in a scene which is vague and open on all sides like a public square.³ He bids the dramatist study the scenery and the arrangement of the setting. If the action is what he calls "pacific," his scenery will be composed of palaces and gardens; but if the action represents a tumult, war, and the chase, the dramatist will choose for the place of the action the vastness of fields and forests. Care must be taken to see that a cave scene is not used for a hunting scene; and one must be sure that the beautiful spectacles furnished by perspectives,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 412.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 411 f.

caves, woods, palaces, and other scenes are not contrary to reason or verisimilitude. Thus does he apply the classical test of reason to the construction and arrangement of scenery; but in regard to the interpretation of the rule of the unity of place he is very free. He says that according to the *unité de la scène* the action should not be carried to different climates, but it should be bounded by the extent of a small country.¹ La Mesnardière is interpreting the rule of the unity of place, not in accordance with reason or verisimilitude, but in terms of the contemporary stage decoration. His expression *unité de la scène* is evidence that he was thinking of stage conventions and conditions, and not of the theories of the critics. To observe the unity of time was much easier. Time could be indefinite, and the audience could be deceived; but with the different scenes before the eyes of the spectator, he easily recognized a violation of the unity of place. The system of stage setting was in direct opposition to the rule; and that is one reason why d'Aubignac could say that he knew of only one play which observed the unity of place: Corneille's *Horace*.

By the time that d'Aubignac is writing his *Pratique du théâtre*, the multiple stage decoration has not been discarded, for he criticizes the young poets who are inspired to write a play and place France at one end of the stage, Turkey at the other, and Spain in the middle, while if anyone is supposed to pass over the sea from Denmark to France, the action is indicated by the drawing of a scene. He also points out the mistake of the poets who place on the stage at the same time some characters supposed to be in Spain and others supposed to be in France.² The fact that he makes fun of this procedure is evidence that the old system is still used. Otherwise he would not have attacked it. He is evidently thinking of a stage on which several scenes are set at once, and, also, of a change of scene.

D'Aubignac is far more restricted than La Mesnardière in his interpretation of the unity of place. He asserts that the ground on which the actors walk must not change; and that the place represented by the stage cannot be greater than the space in which a man can see another, although recognition may not be possible.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 416 ff.

² *Pratique du théâtre*, I, 24 and 95.

However, this does not preclude a change of scenery, which can be managed as follows:

. . . . des-lors qu'on a choisi un Terrain pour commencer quelque action par représentation, il le faut supposer immobile dans tout le reste du Poëme, comme il l'est en effet. Il n'en est pas de même du fond, et des côtes du Théâtre; car comme ils ne figurent que les choses qui environnoient dans la vérité les Personnages agissans, et qui pouvoient recevoir quelque changement, ils peuvent aussi changer en la représentation; et c'est en cela que consistent les changemens de Scènes, et ces Décorations dont la variété ravit toujours le peuple, et même les habiles quand elles sont bien faites. Ainsi nous avons vu sur un Théâtre une façade de temple ornée d'une belle architecture, et puis venant à s'ouvrir, on découvroit en ordre de perspective des colonnes, un autel, et tout le reste des autres ornemens merveilleusement représentez; tellement que le lieu ne changeoit point, et cependant souffroit une belle Décoration.¹

The Mahelot *Mémoire* records a similar change of scene in Benserade's *Iphis et Iante*, giving the direction: "The temple is closed until the fifth act and opens in the middle of the act." Racine employs the same device in *Athalie*, and Voltaire revives it in his *Mahomet* as late as 1742.

D'Aubignac does not stop with this compromise between a rigorous observance of the unity of place and scenic change, which is so important an element of drama even in his generation. He wishes to preserve at all costs the unity of place, which, he says, "now passes as valid"; but the old system of stage setting so appeals to him that he tries to reconcile it to the rule of the unity of place in the following manner:

. . . . on pourroit feindre un Palais sur le bord de la Mer abandonné à de pauvres gens de la campagne; Un Prince arrivant aux côtes par naufrage, qui le feroit orner de riches tapisseries, lustres, bras dorez, tableaux et autres meubles précieux: Après on y feroit mettre le feu par quelque aventure, et le faisant tomber dans l'embrasement, la Mer paroîtroit derrière, sur laquelle on pourroit encore représenter un combat de Vaisseaux. Si bien que dans cinq changemens de Théâtre, l'Unité du lieu seroit ingénieusement gardée.

Ce n'est pas que le Sol ou l'Aire de l'Avant-Scène ne puisse changer aussi bien que le fond et les côtes, ou que ce soit seulement en la superficie; car cela se feroit sans perdre l'unité du lieu: Par exemple, ainsi que les Géants portèrent dans la Fable Pelion sur Osse: Ou si par un débordement de

¹ *Op. cit.*, I, 90.

quelque fleuve, l'Avant-Scène venoit à être couverte d'eau, ainsi que le Tybre à Rome sous Auguste: Ou enfin si par Magie on faisoit sortir de terre des flammes et des braziers ardents, qui tout d'un coup vinnent à couvrir le Sol de l'Avant-Scène. En toutes ces rencontres donc le lieu recevoit du changement, et même fort notable, sans en violer pourtant l'unité.¹

It must be confessed that these scenes smack pretty strongly of romantic melodrama to have been devised by a classicist, and they show how strong was the tradition of the multiple stage decoration. On the other hand, d'Aubignac objected to the stage representing a whole town or even showing the different apartments of a palace; and he adds that his objection cannot be answered by saying that to mark the different apartments there may be curtains to shut and draw, for these curtains are fit for nothing but to toss their inventors in.² He would have had a hard time in so punishing the inventors of this device, for the use of these curtains dates back to the Middle Ages.

The procedure of changing scenes had evidently come more and more into vogue, for d'Aubignac advises that all permanent scenes to be represented be already placed on the stage when the play begins, in order that the surprise and applause which generally attend such sights may be over before the actors begin to speak. If it is necessary to change the decorations, the shift should be made in the interval between the acts so that the stage hands may have time to get their machine moving.³ Thus the scenery seems to have been concealed from view before the play began, otherwise d'Aubignac would not have suggested that the scenery be set at the *ouverture du théâtre*, so that the murmurs of the audience might subside before the actors began. As for the dropping of the curtain between the acts, Bapst says that this did not happen until the nineteenth century;⁴ but that statement must be modified somewhat. Perhaps as a rule the entr'actes were marked by violin playing and the scene remained in full view of the spectators. D'Aubignac warns poets not to suppose that events have taken place between the acts in the scene shown on the stage, "which is open and exposed to the eyes of the spectators" during the intermissions, for in that case the audience ought to have seen those things which are supposed to have happened.⁵ If a change

¹ *Op. cit.*, I, 91.

² *Ibid.*, I, 94.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 326.

⁴ Bapst, *op. cit.*, p. 385.

⁵ D'Aubignac, I, 218.

had to be made in the scenery at any time during the performance, the curtain was dropped. This curtain is described by d'Aubignac as the "toile de devant, qui ne fait point partie de la décoration, et qu'on tire seulement quand on y veut changer quelque chose; afin que le peuple ne s'aperçoive point du désordre qui se fait en ces ajustmens, et qu'il soit plus agréablement surpris en voyant soudainement une nouvelle face du théâtre."¹ Music accompanied this drawing of a curtain to mark a change of scene, for d'Aubignac says sarcastically that to pass from France to Denmark "il ne faut que trois coups d'archet ou tirer le rideau."²

An example of a play in which changes of scenery were made during the intermissions is found in Molière's *Don Juan*. Laurent records the setting as follows: first act, a palace; second act, a room and a sea; third act, a wood and a tomb; fourth act, a room; fifth act, the tomb. The setting for the second act—a room and a sea—is practically a simultaneous setting. The decoration for *Andromaque*, given as "a palace with columns and a sea with ships," also the setting for *Iphigénie*, given as "tents and a sea with ships," correspond in a modified way to the simultaneous scenes of the old system. In such scenes as the last, the unity of place is not destroyed by the scenery; and this system is far better suited to preserve the unity of place than the procedure of changing scenes between the acts or at any other time during the performance. This point was brought out very plainly by Cailhava at the end of the eighteenth century. He called attention to the fact that the first act of *Démocrète amoureux* takes place in a wood and the other acts are at the court. Thus, while these two places are not far distant, yet the changes in decoration destroy the illusion. The author of *Isabelle et Gertrude*, however, in making the action take place during the night, part of the time in a dark garden and part of the time in a lighted room, had the theater represent a garden embellished with a boudoir, but placed so that the

¹ *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 182.

² Another bit of evidence that the curtain was sometimes lowered between the acts in the next century is furnished by a passage in the *Journal littéraire* (VI, 44) quoted by Arnaud (*op. cit.*, p. 384) as a piece of almost contemporary criticism. Unfortunately, Arnaud does not give the exact date of the passage; but the *Journal littéraire* belongs to the eighteenth century. In criticizing d'Aubignac's rigorous interpretation of the unity of place the *Journal* says: "Pourquoi ne pourrait-on s'imaginer que, pendant que le rideau est baissé, dans l'intervalle d'un acte, on est transporté, avec les acteurs, de la galerie du Louvre aux Tuileries. . . ."

spectator saw everything which happened on the whole breadth of the stage. Thus, he claims, the illusion was increased instead of being destroyed, as it is when walls and cities disappear at the sound of the stage manager's whistle.¹

Since the changing of scenery was out of keeping with the unity of place, either the somewhat modified multiple stage setting or the single indefinite scene had to come into use when the rule became binding. It was Corneille who found a way out of the difficulty in the vague and inexact settings which had been so criticized until 1660, the date of his *Discours*. He advocated an indefinite scene—a *lieu théâtral*—which would not be the apartment of any one character, but into which all apartments would open and in which the characters would speak, as if they were in their own rooms. Thus the actors on the stage, instead of going to the apartments of the other characters, could remain on the stage and be sought by the latter. In this way the continuity of scenes would be preserved and the unity of place would be observed.² The stage setting of the *Cid* described by Laurent as *une chambre à quatre portes* corresponds exactly to this scheme of a *lieu théâtral*, and perhaps was introduced at Corneille's request. Corneille also advocated naming only the general place in which the action was supposed to happen, as Paris or Rome; and even if two places were necessary to the action, he recommended that they be not marked by different scenery and that they remain unnamed. This expedient, he says, will help to deceive the spectator, who, not seeing the different places marked, will not perceive the change of scene except by critical and malicious reflexion, while in the *Menteur* the different decorations made the change of place only too visible.³ He admits in the *Examen* of the *Place royale* that he has violated the unity of place by introducing the scene in Angélique's room; but this is necessary because the heroine would not lament in the street. He had used the old system in his early plays, although he had given up the liberty of placing Rome and Constantinople on the stage at the same time. Yet he merely reduced his unity of place to a whole city in these early plays, and

¹ Calhava, *De l'art de la comédie*, Paris, Vol. I, 242.

² Corneille, *Œuvres* (collection des grands écrivains), Paris, 1862, I, 119 f.

³ *Loc. cit.*

allowed the scene to change. He was guided in this, not by reason, but by theatrical conventions of his time. In the *Examen of Andromède*, moreover, Corneille defends his violation of the rule on the ground that such plays, depending for success on their scenery, require the action to be placed in different localities. In fact he declares that a city hardly suffices. Thus the rule of the unity of place seems to have been quite elastic, at least as far as general practice is concerned, up to 1660. The critics could theorize as much as they pleased, but the only limit imposed upon the rule by the playwrights was the limits of a city. It is after this date that the vague *palais à volonté* becomes the more usual scene, but even then it is by no means the only one. Had it been the regular setting before that time, Corneille would hardly have taken the trouble to advocate its use in order to preserve the illusion of the unity of place.

The fact that the later plays of Corneille and the plays of Racine were produced with one scene, coupled with the great reputation of these men, is likely to bring one to the conclusion that in the latter half of the seventeenth century the stage was always set with one vague and unchangeable scene; but such was not the case, as is proved by the second part of the *Mémoire*. On the contrary, there were several methods which grew out of the different ways of combining the old simultaneous setting with the present system of changing scenes. The single scene could be modified in two ways, as has been shown: (1) by following d'Aubignac's suggestion of opening up a temple, a procedure which was carried out by Racine in *Athalie*; or (2) by making the one scene large enough to show two places not far distant, as in the setting of *Andromaque*, which shows a palace with columns and, in the background, a sea with ships. The *Menteur* and *Don Juan*, the latter being recorded after August 25, 1680, are examples of plays in which changes of scene were made between the acts. In 1678, Corneille's *Le comte d'Essex* is presented with a change of scene in the fourth act in which the prison appears. *Jodelet prince*, by Scarron, and a *Mariamne*, of uncertain authorship, recorded by Laurent after 1678, also change the scenery between the acts. *La femme juge et party*, in which the "théâtre est deux maisons sur le devant et le reste une chambre," is an example of the old simultaneous setting still in use at this time, the setting being thus

described by Laurent in 1678. *La dame invisible*, by Th. Corneille and Hauteroche, produced in 1684, requires a street scene for the first act and two separate rooms for the second act, thus showing a combination of the two systems of stage setting. Out of ninety-three plays whose setting is described in the second part of the *Mémoire*, thirty-six employ one of these means to bring about a change of scene. This number does not include the plays which require a public square and houses, although they, too, are merely modifications of the old mediaeval method.

When one calls to mind the famous *pièces à machines*, such as *Andromède* and *La toison d'or*, the ballets, and the representations at court of even classical tragedies, such as *Iphigénie*,¹ it is easily seen that the theater-goer of the latter half of the seventeenth century was not at all unaccustomed to fairly good stage setting and to changes of scenery brought about in one way or another, in spite of the acceptance of the rule of the unity of place. The rule was evidently stronger in theory than in practice. It modified scenery by reducing the number of scenes which might be represented and by reducing the extent of the scene, first to a town and then to a certain part of a town; but, although the single setting appeared for the majority of plays, this majority is not overwhelming, if the *Mémoire* may be taken as evidence. The existence of scenery militated against the acceptance of the rule of the unity of place and robbed it of much of its force even after the contemporary critics asserted that it was accepted.

DONALD CLIVE STUART

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

¹ See the description of this setting as given in the *Mercure galant* (1675); Lemaitre, *Racine*, Paris, 1908, p. 226.

NOTES ON THE *BOURGEOIS GENTILHOMME*

I. TOUT CE QUI N'EST POINT VERS, N'EST POINT PROSE

In Act III, scene iii, of Molière's masterpiece, *Le bourgeois gentilhomme*, there is a passage of considerable interest upon which editors have not agreed. It is our purpose in this note to present a few suggestions which have influenced our decision in favor of one group of editors as opposed to the other. As far as we know, the arguments that we offer have not as yet been put forward in their completeness even by an editor who favors the reading that we feel forced to adopt.

The passage in the original edition of 1671 whose text is adopted by Despois-Mesnard is as follows:

Monsieur Jourdain, puffed with pride at his recently acquired knowledge that the language of ordinary conversation is prose, is endeavoring to impress this fact upon his good wife:

Monsieur Jourdain: Hé non! ce n'est pas cela. Ce que nous disons tous deux, le langage que nous parlons à cette heure?

Madame Jourdain: Hé bien?

Monsieur Jourdain: Comment est-ce que cela s'appelle?

Madame Jourdain: Cela s'appelle comme on veut l'appeler.

Monsieur Jourdain: C'est de la prose, ignorante.

Madame Jourdain: De la prose?

Monsieur Jourdain: Oui, de la prose. Tout ce qui est prose, n'est point vers; et tout ce qui n'est point vers, *n'est point prose*. Heu, voilà ce que c'est d'étudier. Et toi [Nicole], sais-tu bien comme il faut faire pour dire U?

The italics above are ours. From the *prose* of the italicized phrase there is a reference to a footnote in the Despois-Mesnard edition (p. 106 of Vol. VIII) as follows: "N'est point vers, est prose. (1674, 82, 94B, 1734.) Y a-t-il une faute dans l'original? Est-ce Molière qui a voulu que Monsieur Jourdain s'embrouillât ici tout à fait?"

This footnote is doubly interesting. In the first place we see

that no edition is mentioned as having what is a perfectly possible other variant, namely:

et tout ce qui est vers, n'est point prose.

If we ask why, two reasons seem probable. Had this other possible correction been made, the whole phrase would have run:

(A) Tout ce qui est prose, n'est point vers; et tout ce qui est vers, n'est point prose.

This phrase is not as well balanced as:

(B) Tout ce qui est prose, n'est point vers; et tout ce qui n'est point vers, est prose,

which is the reading of 1674 and subsequent editions. Moreover, had the correction been made as in (A) above, the whole phrase would have been just as sensible as what the *maitre de philosophie* had said in Act II, scene iv:

Tout ce qui n'est point prose est vers; et tout ce qui n'est point vers est prose.

The only difference is that the negatives are in the second and fourth clauses, instead of being in the first and third.

Now the reading (B) above has one peculiarity that is not immediately apparent. Although it makes sense, the second part is nothing but an inverted repetition of the first:

First: Tout ce qui est prose, *n'est point vers*.

Second: Et tout ce qui *n'est point vers*, est prose.

The italics may help to bring this fact out clearly, and also reveal the peculiar balance of the phrase.

It is of course true that there is some humor in this repetition, Jourdain does not get the whole of what the teacher had said, but what he gets he says twice. Our feeling, however, is that this humor is too veiled to be immediately apparent in dialogue uttered rapidly, and that even when it is grasped, the humorous touch is not as great or vigorous as what stood in the original 1671 edition, namely:

Tout ce qui est prose, n'est point vers; et tout ce qui n'est point vers, n'est point prose.

The nonsense of this is immediately grasped by the average listener or reader, whereas the repetition of a perfectly sensible

remark, as in the text of 1674, etc., lacks the quality and the quantity of spontaneous humor which is the eminent characteristic of Molière.

The second reason why the note in Despois-Mesnard is interesting is this: The editor, M. Mesnard, does not offer his own solution or even suggest his preference. As a result editors have divided themselves into two groups. Among those who have adopted the reading, "n'est point vers, est prose," which, as noted, first appears in the edition of 1674, are: L. Moland, M. Pellisson, G. Vapereau, F. M. Warren, M. Levi, Moriarity, Wilhelm Scheffler, C. Humbert, Adolf Laun, Francis Tarver, Marc Ceppi, Roi-Guitteau, Schele de Vere.

The group that has preferred the reading of the original edition of 1671, "n'est point vers, n'est point prose," includes: Ch. L. Livet, W. Mangold, Platow, Georges Monval, Ernest Thirion, Maurice Albert.

Of these Albert alone calls attention to a similar misquoting by Harpagon in Act III, scene i, of *L'avare*. Valère has just suggested to him the *dire d'un ancien*: "il faut manger pour vivre, et non pas vivre pour manger."

Harpagon: Ah! que cela est bien dit! Approche, que je t'embrasse pour ce mot. Voilà la plus belle sentence que j'aie entendue de ma vie. Il faut vivre pour manger, et non pas manger pour vi Non, ce n'est pas cela. Comment est-ce que tu dis?

It is worthy of note that Harpagon, although a shrewd fellow, is yet made to misquote something that has been told him immediately before, all this of course in the interest of humor. May we not think that Molière had a similar humorous purpose when he allows the stupid Jourdain to misquote in such a way that the result is nonsense? Is not such a misquoting the more possible since Jourdain's lesson with the teacher of philosophy had occurred in the previous act? In this connection we quote the note of Thirion before adding to its general argument, some suggestions of our own: "M. Jourdain répète mal la leçon de son maître de philosophie et finit, en s'embrouillant, par dire des choses qui n'ont pas de sens. Certains éditeurs voient ici une faute d'impression; mais rien n'est plus naturel que l'embarras de M. Jourdain à répéter des choses auxquelles il ne comprend goutte."

Thirion is perfectly right in our opinion. Jourdain is incapable of repeating anything that is told him by his several teachers. He mixes everything up. Take as first instance the effort to repeat the description of the pronunciation of U which follows immediately:

Tu allonges les lèvres en dehors, et approches la mâchoire d'en haut de celle d'en bas. [!]

Only the first part of this description, "en allongeant les deux lèvres en dehors," is in the description of U as given by the *maître de philosophie* in Act II, scene iv. The second part is a comical inversion of the description of the vowel E:

Maître de philosophie: La voix E se forme en rapprochant la mâchoire d'en bas de celle d'en haut.

Georges Monval in his edition of the *Bourgeois gentilhomme* (note on p. 160), having adopted the reading "n'est point prose" of the original edition, comments on this and on the comical description of U by Jourdain as follows: "Est-il besoin de faire remarquer que M. Jourdain répète tout de travers la leçon du maître de philosophie?"

Not only, however, does Jourdain repeat awry the lesson of the *maître de philosophie*, but he twists around the complimentary phrases in Act IV, scene iv, by which Covielle assumes to translate the Turkish of Cléonte:

Covielle: C'est-à-dire: "Monsieur Jourdain, votre cœur soit toute l'année comme un rosier fleuri."

Jourdain remembers this vaguely in Act V, scene iii, when he tries to use it in a compliment to Dorimène:

Madame, je vous souhaite toute l'année votre rosier fleuri.

Similarly Covielle's rendering (Act IV, scene iv); "que le ciel vous donne la force des lions et la prudence des serpents," becomes completely inverted in Jourdain's compliment to Dorante (Act V, scene iii):

Monsieur, je vous souhaite la force des serpents et la prudence des lions.

This inversion is of the same order as that made by Harpagon in *L'avare* which we have noted above.

Not only is Jourdain incapable of repeating lessons given him orally or compliments which he hears, but he is equally stupid when

he tries to dance, to fence, or even to make the famous third bow to Dorimène. His absurdly literal interpretations of his instructions mark him out the fool that Molière clearly intended. Jourdain is unable to learn any of the things that he tries so hard to learn, and in this fact lies most of the humor of his character, and indeed, to some readers, an element of pathos as well.

Our final thought is this: If the correction from "n'est point prose" of the original 1671 edition to the "est prose" of later editions is to be accepted, the whole statement then becomes the *only* thing of all that Jourdain is taught which he repeats correctly. As such it would stand out in sharp contrast to the many things that he utterly fails to repeat correctly. We cannot think that Molière so intended. Ever alive to the humor of a situation, he surely would not let slip the excellent opportunity afforded by this incident. Once we grant that a nonsensical misquotation is more humorous than a correct repetition, we must, it seems safe to say, prefer the reading of the original edition to the attempt to correct this in any or in all later editions.

An interesting side-light is afforded by the 1671 imitation in England by Ravenscroft, *The Citizen turned Gentleman*. Here in the corresponding passage one reads: "Yes, Prose, all that is prose is not verse and all that is not verse is not prose." The translator appreciated the humor intended sufficiently to prefer its retention to its elimination.

II. CHÂTIMENTS. SOUFFLETS

In Act III, scene ix, Cléonte and Covielle, master and servant, are venting their displeasure at the treatment accorded them by their sweethearts, Lucile and Nicole. Cléonte as the better educated uses the language of his social station which Covielle parodies or imitates in a very humorous manner. Cléonte's words are well chosen and elegant, befitting his superior culture, whereas Covielle's suggest the kitchen:

Cléonte: Tant de larmes que j'ai versées à ses genoux!

Covielle: Tant de seaux d'eau que j'ai tirés au puits pour elle!

Cléonte: Tant d'ardeur que j'ai fait paroltre à la chérir plus que moi-même!

Covielle: Tant de chaleur que j'ai soufferte à tourner la broche à sa place!

Cléonte: Elle me fuit avec mépris!

Covielle: Elle me tourne le dos avec effronterie!

Cléonte: C'est une perfidie digne des plus grands *châtiments*.

Covielle: C'est une trahison à mériter mille *soufflets*. etc. etc.

So runs the text of the Despois-Mesnard edition and of all French editions which we have seen. In a group of editions in English, however, the words *châtiments* and *soufflets* have in some mysterious way changed places. This group comprises the editions by Francis Tarver, Schele de Vere, F. M. Warren, and Roi-Guitteau. We have searched in vain for some warrant for this change. No such variant is furnished by the standard edition of Despois-Mesnard and, as far as we know, no such variant exists anywhere. It seems, judging by the context, that the elegant word *châtiments* should naturally belong to the educated master, and that the coarser word *soufflets* should be uttered by the servant. Pending the discovery of some warrant for the changed positions of these words, we believe that we have in these four English editions a typographical error, which was made first in the oldest of the four and repeated in the others through neglect of collating their text carefully with that of the standard edition. If this supposition be correct, we have rather an interesting example of the propagation of an error, and we trust that this note may help in its removal.

THOMAS EDWARD OLIVER

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

**EVERY WOMAN IN HER HUMOR AND THE DUMB
KNIGHT**

"Every Woman in Her Humor."—*Every Woman in Her Humor* was printed in 1609 with the following scant title-page: "Everie Woman in her Humor. London. Printed by E. A. for Thomas Archer, and are to be solde at his shop in the Popes-head-Pallace, neere the Royall Exchange. 1609." The play, as its name indicates, is an imitation in part of Jonson's two early comedies of humor; and it is frankly indebted for the suggestion of several of its characters and some of its plot, to *Every Man Out of His Humour*. Mr. Bullen, who reprinted the play in his *Collection of Old English Plays*, speaks highly of its merits:

The jolly fat host, with his cheery cry, "merry hearts live long," is pleasant company; and his wife, the hard-working hostess, constantly repining at her lot, yet seemingly not dissatisfied at heart, has the appearance of being a faithful transcript from life. Cornutus (the hen-pecked citizen) and his gadding wife are familiar figures, but not the less welcome on that account. Getica's anxiety at the loss of her dog is amusingly depicted.

The title-page of the play gives no indication of its authorship, and so far no one has been able to venture a suggestion on this point; even Fleay, with his wide knowledge of the Tudor-Stuart drama, and his extraordinary daring in such matters, has had to confess himself at a loss: "I do not pretend," says he, "to guess at the authorship."¹

"The Dumb Knight" and Its Two Authors.—*The Dumb Knight* was entered in the Stationers' Registers on October 6, 1608, and was printed shortly after, with the statement that it had been "acted sundry times by the children of his Maiesties Revels." It was the product of two writers, Lewis Machin, who signs the address "To the Understanding Reader," and Gervase Markham, whose name appears on the title-page of some copies.

Of Machin nothing seems to be known, except that his name is affixed to "three Eglogs" at the end of William Barkstead's *Mirrha*,

¹ *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 322.

the *Mother of Adonis* (1607). Neither Winstanley nor Langbaine tells us anything about him, and *The Dictionary of National Biography* gives merely a passing reference to him in its article on Henry Machin.¹

Markham was a versatile writer, "whose worth," as his collaborator Machin truly says, "hath been often approved." He is best known, perhaps, as a voluminous author of books on husbandry; but in his long poem, *The Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile* (1595),² written in ottava rima and full of rich imagery, he shows himself to be a poet of no mean ability; and in *The Teares of the Beloved* (1600) and *Marie Magdalene's Teares* (1601)³, he reveals a serious and lofty vein. Grosart says of this poetry: "It is quiet, tranquil, simple, with only now and again a touch of pathos or quaint symbolism. Occasionally, too, there are things that lay hold of and stick to the memory." Markham was not intimately connected with theatrical affairs; and although he later collaborated with William Sampson on another play, *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater: With the Death of faire Marriam, According to Josephus the learned and famous Jewe*,⁴ we may suppose that he was relatively unfamiliar with dramatic composition.

A Division of the Work of the Two Authors.—It is easy to distinguish between the work of the two collaborators. One of them, obviously, composed the serious main plot, written in smooth blank verse that is sometimes illuminated by beautiful passages, and is always rich in poetic imagery; the other, obviously, contributed the comic sub-plot, written for the most part in prose, full of coarse humor, and abounding in the most indelicate allusions. But not only are the two plots distinct in manner; they are separate and complete units, dealing each with virtually a different set of characters. Furthermore, they are inadequately and inartistically

¹ Fleay, with unusual rashness, assigns to him *The Fair Maid of the West* (*Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 329-30).

² Reprinted in Arber's *English Reprints*. Tennyson is said to have been indebted to the poem for some of the imagery in *The Revenge*.

³ These two poems are reprinted by Grosart in *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*, II (1871).

⁴ This play has not been reprinted, but a full description is given in Mr. Arthur Cyril Dunstan's *Examination of Two English Dramas*, a Königsberg dissertation, 1908. Professor Schelling assigns the play to 1621.

joined. The inconsistency and the incongruity of the sub-plot, wherever it touches the main plot, is to the careful reader painfully obvious. A close study of the play leads to the almost inevitable conclusion that the two authors did not write in intimate collaboration. The main plot, I believe, was first composed in a serious vein, without any comic relief; later, to the second author was given (probably by the theatrical manager) the task of fitting the play with a humorous sub-plot. In itself this sub-plot is successful enough (perhaps exactly what the theatrical manager wanted), but its author has shown little skill in uniting it to the main story. To accomplish a linking he took a relatively unimportant character in the main plot, Lord Alphonso, and made him the chief character in the sub-plot: or, to be more exact, he borrowed the name "Lord Alphonso" for one of his leading comic characters; for we find great difficulty in reconciling the original Lord Alphonso, the lofty "marshall of the realm" and the Queen's champion, with the libertine that we are called upon to laugh at in the comic scenes. The author of the serious plot conceived the character of Alphonso thus:¹

Cyp. Who are your combatants?
Queen The next Alphonso, sprung from noble blood,
 Who laden with rich Lusitanian prize
 Hath rode through Syracuse twice in pomp.

And to the Duke of Cyprus, Alphonso says:

Nay more, we are the sons of destiny,
 Virtue's our guide, our aim is dignity.

Yet the writer of the sub-plot turned this nobly conceived character into a silly lecher, the victim of a coarse joke, in which he is anything but dignified.

The taking of Alphonso for this purpose led to other inconsistencies. For example, the author of the sub-plot creates the character of Mechant, a petitioner to Prate the Orator. He first appears in the second act (p. 137) with two other petitioners, Drap, "a country gentleman," and Velours, "a citizen," where he speaks only one line; in a later scene he explains his presence in the play with

¹ Here and throughout this paper I quote from the edition of *The Dumb Knight* in Hazlitt's Dodsley, Vol. X.

a statement that is wholly unprepared for and highly improbable (p. 144); and to seek redress for his wrongs at the hands of the Queen ("The Queen, out of suspicion . . . casts me from favour, seizes all my lands, and turns my naked fortunes to the cold"), he humbly petitions several noblemen to arrange for him an audience with the King. The noblemen, however, contemptuously refer him ("they despise and slight" him "in their meanest compliments") to Prate the Orator, who scornfully tells him to "go home, repent, pray, and die." But in Act IV we are astonished to find this same Mechant an honored guest at a private dance in the royal palace, talking pleasantly in the company of the Queen who had so wronged him, and dancing as the elected partner of the Duke's sister, Mariana. I feel sure that in this scene, as originally written by the author of the serious plot, Mariana's dancing partner was Lord Alphonso (who elsewhere is her good friend; cf. pp. 151-52, 153); but the arranger of the sub-plot could not allow Alphonso to appear in this scene, for at that very time the Alphonso of the sub-plot was walking the street in the clothes of Prate the Orator, and in the scene immediately following must be arrested in that ludicrous costume. Apparently the author of the sub-plot merely changed the catchword "*Alph.*" to "*Mech.*" Again, in a subsequent scene (p. 193), for the same reasons, he makes the same change, although it results in representing the King as having entrusted to Mechant a highly important commission—exactly such a commission as he would have entrusted to Alphonso, the marshal of the realm.

Another bit of evidence for believing that the sub-plot was a later product inartistically fused with the main plot is to be found in its chronology. According to the sub-plot not more than a day and a half has elapsed between the beginning and the end of the play, for Alphonso and Prate have not had time at the final scene to change their ridiculous costumes; yet, according to the main plot, several weeks must have elapsed.

Further evidence, if it were needed, could be adduced to prove that the main plot was written first, and that the sub-plot was later and inartistically added for comic relief.

Markham the Author of the Main Plot.—To Markham, without much doubt, should be attributed the dignified heroic plot in blank

verse.¹ It clearly reveals the ready hand of an experienced poet; and although the effect of the play as a whole may not be impressive, its serious parts contain many individual passages of beauty. The numerous references to classical themes, too, indicate an extensive and intimate knowledge of ancient writers. In this respect the play resembles *The Tragedie of Sir Richard Grinuile*. Markham, we know, was an excellent classical scholar, and was also versed in French, Italian, Spanish, and probably Dutch literature. This broad reading reveals itself, unobtrusively but surely, in the lines of the main plot.

Again, the main plot is notable, like *Sir Richard Grinuile*, for its laudation of high ideals of valor. In order to realize this fully, the reader should examine the serious plot by itself. Cyprus says to his Iago-like friend, Duke Epire:

Duke, thou art valiant, and with a valiant mind
Slander is worse than theft or sacrilege.

And before the combat Florio says:

This day shall stand two famous monuments;
The one a throne of glory bright as gold,
Burnish'd with angel's lustre, and with stars
Pluck'd from the crown of conquest, in which shall sit
Men made half-gods through famous victory.

The last line may be an echo from Markham's *Richard Grinuile*:

And for his valor half a God did make.²

It should be remembered, too, that Markham was a soldier of distinction. Langbaine speaks highly of his military career: "In the enumeration of his Works the Reader will be satisfied of his excellent

¹ Fleay, *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 68, attributes to Markham, on no evidence, the comic sub-plot; then later in the same volume (p. 330) attributes the sub-plot to Machin. In the latter case, he uses the attribution to prove that Machin wrote *The Fair Maid of the Exchange*.

² Arber's *Reprint*, p. 85; cf. also:

That men half-gods shall call [p. 65].
Making them gods for god-like victory [p. 76].

There seems to be a similarity in idea in the following passages:

Nor Death nor Fate
Are slaves to fear, to hope, or human state.
—*The Dumb Knight*, p. 132.
In this unjust are Fate and Death declared,
That mighty ones, no more than mean, are spared.
—*Sir R. Grinuile*, p. 87.

Perhaps other similarities might be pointed out, although the themes are very different, and many years separate the two works.

Parts and Abilities: and that he was *idm Marti qudm Mercurio*, vers'd in the Employments of War and Peace."

Machin the Author of the Sub-Plot.—The sub-plot we may safely attribute to Machin. So far as I can discover in reading the works of Markham, he is notably deficient in a sense of humor; this, however, cannot be said of the author of the sub-plot, for its comic scenes are highly amusing. Unfortunately, they are obscene beyond the usual license of the Elizabethan drama, and will, consequently, offend modern ears.

Relation of "The Dumb Knight" to "Every Woman."—That much of the comic stuff of *The Dumb Knight* is to be found in *Every Woman in Her Humor* seems not to have been observed. The two female characters of the sub-plot, Lollia and Collaquentida, are identical with the Hostess and the Citty Wife of the latter play, and in the first scene the language of these characters is repeated *verbatim*. In the rest of the play, too, and in other characters of *The Dumb Knight* we recognize bits of humor that appear in *Every Woman*. To indicate the extent and closeness of the borrowing in the first scene, I quote below a passage at length.

The Dumb Knight, pp. 121-23

Lol. Now fie upon 't, who would be an orator's wife, and not a gentlewoman, if she could choose? A lady is the most sweet lascivious life, congies and kisses—the tire, O the tire, made castle upon castle, jewel upon jewel, knot upon knot; crowns, garlands, gardings, and what not? the hood, the rebato, the French fall, the loose-bodied gown, the pin in the hair; no clawing the pate, then picking the teeth, and every day change; when we poor souls must come and go for every man's pleasure: and what's a lady more than another body? We have legs and hands, and rolling eyes, hanging lips, sleek brows, cherry cheeks, and other things as ladies have—but the fashion carries it away.

Enter Mistress Collaquentida

Col. Why how now, Mistress Prate? i' th' old disease still? will it never be better? cannot a woman find one kind man amongst twenty? O the days that I have seen, when the law of a woman's wit could have put her husband's purse to execution!

Lol. O Mistress Collaquentida, mine is even the unnaturallest man to his wife—

Col. Faith, for the most part all scholars are so, for they take so upon them to know all things, that indeed they know nothing; and besides they

"EVERY WOMAN IN HER HUMOR" AND "THE DUMB KNIGHT" 7

are with study and ease grown so unwieldy, that a woman shall ne'er want a sore stomach that's troubled with them.

Lol. And yet they must have the government of all.

Col. True, and great reason they have for it: but a wise man will put it in a woman's hand: what! she'll save what he spends.

Lol. You have a pretty ruff, how deep is it?

Col. Nay this is but shallow; marry, I have a ruff is a quarter deep, measured by the yard.

Lol. Indeed! by the yard?

Col. By the standard, I assure you: you have a pretty set, too! how big is the steel you set with?

Lol. As big as a reasonable sufficient—

Every Woman, pp. 317-20

Hostis. Oh fye upont, who would be an hostis, & could do otherwise?
[A] Ladie [h]as the most lascivious life, conges and kisses, the tyre, the hood, the rebato, the loose bodyed Gowne, the pin in the haire, and everie day change, when an Hostis must come and go at everye mans pleasure. And what's a Lady more then another body? Wee have legs, and hands, rowling eyes and hanging lips, sleek browes, and cherie cheeks & other things as Ladies have, but the fashion carries it away.

*Enter Cittizens Wife*¹

City W. Why how now, woman, a 'th olde disease still? will it never be better? cannot a Woman finde one kinde man amongst twentie? Ah the daies I have seen, when a Womans will was a lawe: If I had a mind to such a thing, or such a thing, I could have had it, but twa's never better since men were Purse-bearers.

Hosty. Mine is een the unnaturallist man to his Wife.

Cittie wi. Truely, and commonly are all such fat men: ile tell thee, Gossip, I have buried sixe, I, sixe husbands, but if I should live to have as many more, as I know not what may happen, but sure Ide never have such a fatte man: they be the most unweldey men: that woman shall not want a sore stomack, that's troubled with them, I warrant her.²

Hostis. And yet they must have the government of all.

City w. And great reason they have for it, but a wise man will put [it] in a Woman's hand: what sheele save that hee spends.

Hostis. You have a pretty Ruffe, how deepe is it?

City w. Nay this is but shallowe, marrie I have a Ruffe is a quarter deepe, measured by the yard.

Hostis. Indeede, by the yard.

¹ In meantime, the Host has come upon the stage and reproached the Hostess for not looking to the guests. I have omitted twenty-six lines.

² At this point I have omitted eighteen lines.

City w. By the standard: you have a pretty set, too, how big is the steele you set it with?

Hostis. As bigge as a reasonable sufficient—

"Every Woman" Written First.—A close examination of the two plays leads to the conclusion that *Every Woman* was written first, and that its comic material was drawn upon by Machin to piece out the sub-plot of *The Dumb Knight*. In *Every Woman* the puns and the humorous language seem more spontaneous and to suit the characters and the situation more perfectly; in *The Dumb Knight*, on the other hand, the author seems at times to go out of his way to bring in the successful wit of the other play. For example, in the passage I have quoted, it will be observed that the bitter complaint of Lollia ("Who would be an orator's wife, and not a gentlewoman?") is much less appropriate in the mouth of the wife of Prate, the King's Orator, who has charge of the government's most important business, and who rides upon his foot-cloth, than in the mouth of the hostess of the Hobbie who is constantly being summoned by her husband and his apprentices to look after the business of the tavern. Likewise, the line, "we poor souls must come and go for every man's pleasure," is quite inappropriate in the mouth of Lollia, but perfectly appropriate in the mouth of the Hostess, who is being loudly called every few minutes to "look about to the guests." Again, the reference to Prate as being very fat is not supported by the rest of the play (for example, Lord Alphonso's clothes fit him to a hair), but in *Every Woman* the host is represented in all the scenes as fat and jolly. Doubtless this explains why in *The Dumb Knight* the remarks about fatness are abbreviated and somewhat modified—the only part of the passage that is seriously altered. The satire on feminine dress, introduced into *The Dumb Knight* without special cause, is also far more appropriate in *Every Woman in Her Humor*, where the author is engaged throughout in satirizing women and in particular their absurdities in costume. Again, the last speech of the passage quoted is suddenly interrupted in *Every Woman* by the entrance of an apprentice summoning the hostess in the name of her husband to "come in" at once; in *The Dumb Knight* there is nothing to explain the incompleteness of the sentence, and modern editors have felt obliged to emend the line.

Finally, on p. 123 Lollia says: "If my husband should rise from his study and miss me, we should have such a coil"; but no cause for this extraordinary apprehension is given. In *Every Woman* this speech is perfectly intelligible; for the Host had once summoned his wife in person, and then upon her failure to come, had twice dispatched his apprentices for her; at the last summons, the Hostess says to her gossip: "By my troth, I must goe, we shall have such a coyle else." Many more instances could be cited to prove that in *The Dumb Knight* Machin was borrowing—not creating—the humorous passages that figure in the two plays.¹

Machin the Author of "Every Woman."—Since Machin gave *The Dumb Knight* to the press, and in a signed letter to the public confidently submits the play to speak for itself in answer to the sharp censure which envious persons had made against his share in the work, we may fairly presume, I think, that he was the author of the anonymous *Every Woman in Her Humor*. He would hardly have appealed with so much assurance to the "understanding" readers had he been guilty of an extensive and impudent plagiarism from the work of another and a contemporary playwright. Moreover, *Every Woman* was not printed until a year after the publication of *The Dumb Knight*; yet the closeness of the textual following (examine the passages I have quoted) indicates that Machin had the manuscript of *Every Woman* before him. Finally, and most important of all, the style of *Every Woman* outside the parallel passages suggests the author of the comic scenes in *The Dumb Knight*. The two plays, one feels, must have been the product of the same mind; the stock of ideas, the quality of the humor, the moral point of view, the tendency to preach, and the general manner of execution are similar. The way in which Mechant stands aloof and moralizes on the conduct of the persons in the sub-plot, and the way in which at the end of the play he brings the wrong-doers before the King, finds a counterpart in the conduct of Acutus in *Every Woman*. Precedent, in *The Dumb Knight*, reads passages from *Venus and Adonis*; Flaminus, in *Every Woman*, says: "Leave Tulley to the Ladies; he can tell them tales of *Venus and Adonis*, and that best pleaseth them"; the words

¹ Direct borrowing from *Every Woman* does not occur after the first scene. Apparently as soon as Machin got the sub-plot under way, he had little difficulty in keeping it going.

"standing" and "stiff" are overworked in both plays for the sake of puns; the satire against lawyers is conspicuous; and a curious mingling of obscenity and moralizing characterizes both.¹

The Date and Company of "Every Woman."—The date of *Every Woman* and the company by which it was acted are problems which have puzzled commentators. Professor Thorndike, in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, V, 31, boldly asserts that it was "acted by 1600," although he gives no reason for his belief; Professor Schelling, in *The Elizabethan Drama*, I, 471, says: "This production was first printed in 1609; but dates plainly from the last years of the old queen's reign." Professor Schelling probably was relying upon the questionable judgment of Fleay, who is himself doubtful: "The date of production was, I think, 1602."² Apparently all commentators on the play have felt it necessary to put the date of *Every Woman* as near as possible to the date of *Every Man in His Humour*, because of the obvious imitation in title. In the play itself, however, there is no evidence for such an early date; Fleay claims that it could not have been written before 1602; and one of the songs put into the mouth of Philautus, "Sister, awake, close not [your eyes]," first appeared in Bateson's *Madrigals* in 1604. The humor of Philautus was to sing snatches from songs that were more or less well known to the audience.

Beyond this no very definite evidence of the date of composition is to be found in the text. The extreme license of the language, however, is not in keeping with the plays of 1600, but is characteristic of many plays written in 1607 and later; and, in particular, it is characteristic of the plays produced by the Children of His Majestie's Revels at the Whitefriars Theatre. This troupe, which flourished in 1607-9, seems to have gone beyond all other companies in the obscenity of its plays. Compare *Ram Alley*, of which Ward, *English Dramatic Literature*, III, 157, says: "A comedy which appears to have earned much popularity by the extreme grossness of its fun"; *The Turke*, of which Isaac Reed, *Biographia Dramatica*, says: "This

¹ *The Dumb Knight* was printed "for Iohn Bache, and are to be sold at his shop in Popes-head Pallace, neere to the Royall Exchange," and *Every Woman* was printed "for Thomas Archer, and are to be solde at his shop in the Popes-head-Pallace, neere the Royall Exchange." *The Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers 1557-1640*, however does not indicate that Bache and Archer were at any time associated with each other.

² *Biog. Chron. Eng. Drama*, II, 322.

tragedy has some beautiful lines and speeches, which, however, are disgraced by intrusions of the lowest and most obscene comedy that has hitherto appeared on the stage"; *Cupid's Whirligig*, of which Professor Sampson, in his paper on "The Plays of Edward Sharpham,"¹ says: "The plot . . . although less repulsive than that of *The Fleire*, is in detail coarser," and he mentions as one of its main characteristics "coarseness of language"; *The Family of Love*, to which Ward applies the adjective "coarse," and Professor Schelling, "gross"; *Humour out of Breath*, "which," says Ward, "has . . . divers lapses into what would be mildly described as indecorum"; and *The Dumb Knight*—which speaks for itself.

A reference in *Every Woman* to an exhibition of trained baboons may have some bearing on the date. On p. 270 we read:

I pray ye what shewe will be heere to night? I have seen the *Babones* already, and the *Cittie of new Ninivie* and *Julius Caesar* acted by the Mammets.

Of course references to motions (i.e., puppet shows), particularly the old and well-known *Nineveh* and *Julius Caesar*, are common at all times; but the reference to the "shewe" of the baboons seems to be to a certain amusing performance by trained baboons that figures conspicuously in *Ram Alley*, written in 1607 for the Children of His Majestie's Revels. On pp. 279-80 (Hazlitt's Dodsley, X), we read: "They say some of our city dames Were much desirous to see the baboons Do their newest tricks"; and this is made the occasion of a long obscene anecdote. Again, in the same play (pp. 348-50), the performance of the baboons is imitated in a highly comic scene. Boutecher and Small-shanks make the braggart Captain Face sit upon a table and go through the several tricks of those animals. Small-shanks plays the part of the manager of the show, cracks his whip, makes a speech to an imaginary audience, and puts the unfortunate Captain through his paces.

W. Small. Remember, noble captain, you skip when I shall shake my whip. Now, sir, What can you do for the great Turk?

[*He performs.*]

What can you do for the Pope of Rome?

[*He performs.*]

What can you do for the town of Geneva, sirrah?

[*He holds up his hands instead of praying.*]

¹ *Studies in Language and Literature in Celebration of the Seventieth Birthday of James Morgan Hart.* New York, 1910.

Obviously the effectiveness of this scene would be greatly heightened by the popularity in 1607 of a particular baboon show; and two widely different and elaborate references in the same play of 1607 indicate that such was the case.

Every Woman was printed in 1609. Owing to pecuniary distress the Children of His Majestie's Revels disbanded early in 1609;¹ their plays were released to the printers, and most of them were issued at once. For a list of these see Fleay's *History of the Stage*, p. 188.

Since Machin's *Dumb Knight* was written for these Children in 1607-8, since his three eclogues were affixed to Barkstead's *Mirrha* in 1607, since *Every Woman* is exactly the type of play acted by the Children, and since it was published in 1609, I am inclined to believe that it dates from about 1607, and that it probably belonged to the repertory of the Whitefriars troupe. The fact that its title imitates Jonson's two early comedies has here little weight; compare John Day's *Humour out of Breath*, written for the Children in 1607-8, of which Ward says: "The title was evidently suggested by the success of Jonson's two comedies." Perhaps there had been a recent revival of Jonson's two early "humour" plays.

Surmises About Machin.—In view of the total absence of biographical facts about Machin, perhaps a few observations, even though vague, drawn from a study of these plays, will be acceptable to the reader.

Machin belonged to a small group of playwrights who furnished plays to the Children of His Majestie's Revels at Whitefriars in 1607-9, and then disappeared entirely from the dramatic horizon. The other members of this group were Lordinge Barry, the author of *Ram Alley*, and John Mason, the author of *The Turke*.² Who these men were, where they came from, and what they did after the Whitefriars troupe disbanded, are unknown. Apparently they entered other walks of life; although in two cases, at least (Barry and Mason), they specifically promised additional plays provided their first efforts met with favor.

¹ See James Greenstreet, "The Whitefriars Theatre in the Time of Shakspeare," *New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1887-90.

² Perhaps I should also mention Edward Sharpham, who after writing *Cupid's Whirligig* disappears from view.

Barry and Mason were part owners of the playhouse; Machin's name, however, does not appear in the chancery suit¹ of February 1609, in which the sharers are several times named, nor is it likely, in view of the distressing condition of the company at that time, and its dissolution shortly after, that he subsequently became connected with its organization.

The company was called the Children of His Majestie's Revels, and of course the actors were in the main children. Yet it is possible that there were also grown-up actors associated with them. Furnivall, in commenting on the chancery suit referred to, says: "From the 'loss of their *places*' in clauses 5 and 8 of the Agreement below, it would seem that some of these six sharers were Players"; and Mr. P. A. Daniel is apparently of the same opinion. I do not believe, however, that the lawsuit furnishes any evidence on this point. Machin, to be sure, shows in several places in *Every Woman* an intimacy with the affairs of the playhouse:

As though none weare perywigges but Players [p. 318].

A comedian tongue is the onely persuasive ornament to win a Lady; why his discourse is as pleasant and keepes as good decorum; his prologue with obedience to the skirt; a rough Sceane of civill Warres, and a clapping conclusion; perhappes a Jigge [p. 329].

Tis even as common to see a Bason at a Church doore, as a Box² at a Playhouse [p. 352].

He would sweare like an Elephant, and stamp and stare (God bless us) like a play-house book-keeper when the actors miss their entrance [p. 354].

Prethee keepe the sceane till I fetch more actors to fill it fuller [p. 363].

But these passages do not necessarily indicate that Machin was an actor. They seem to emanate from a man who had quite recently become familiar with the life of the theater; and they may have been merely the result of his observation as an author, who like Ben Jonson, watched the staging of his play from behind the curtains.

We do not know that Machin was a university student. His name does not appear in the registers of Oxford, but he may, of course, have attended Cambridge. In both plays he shows some knowledge of classical mythology, and in *Every Woman* he quotes

¹ Printed by James Greenstreet in *New Shak. Soc. Trans.*, 1887-90.

² The reference is to the box which the gatherer of the admission money held at the entrance to playhouses.

frequently from Latin authors. Perhaps the following passage from the latter play suggests the attitude of a university student:

Acut. More Ladies *Terentias*, I crie still,
That prise a saint before a Silken foole.
She that loves true learning and pomp disdaines
Treads on *Tartarus* and *Olimpus* gaines.

Grac. I marrie, but then would learning be in
colours, proud, proud; then would not foure nobles
purchase a benefice, two Sermons in a years.

Accut. I, *Graccus*, now thou hitst the finger right
Upon the shoulder of Ingratitude.
Thou hast clapt an action of flat felony;
Now, ill betide that partiall judgement
That doomes a farmers rich adultus
To the supremacie of a Deanrie,
When needie, yet true grounded Discipline,
Is govern'd with a threed bare Vycarage.¹

It seems likely from his exceptional knowledge of law, his frequent use of legal terms, and his continual good-natured satire against lawyers, that he was a young member of that profession. The extraordinary legal knowledge displayed in *Ram Alley* makes it likely that Lordinge Barry also was a lawyer. Perhaps, since Barry was the prime mover in the Whitefriars undertaking, he interested some of his lawyer friends in contributing plays. This would help to explain the fact that after the Whitefriars venture proved unsuccessful, he and his friends disappear from the field of dramatic composition.

Mr. Wallace's Gervase Markham.—In the *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft* (1910, XLVI, 347–50), Mr. Charles William Wallace has printed two legal documents from the Court of Requests, Public Record Office, London, dated 1623 and relating to a certain Gervase Markham, who in 1622 attempted a journey on foot from London to Berwick, with only a leap-staff for crossing streams. The conditions of the journey are stated as follows:

To goe on floote from yo^r: Ma^{tes}: Cyttye of London to yo^r: Ma^{tes}: Towne of Berwicke and that yo^r: sayd Subiecte in his sayd Intended Iorney shoulde nott goe over any apparente Bridge greate or smale whatsoever and that yo^r sayd Subiecte should nott in his sayd Intended Iorney vse dyrectlye

¹ *Every Woman*, pp. 343–44.

or indyrectlye any boate, Shippe, or other Ingin for water more then an ordinarye Leape staffe or staffe to leape wthall, neither shoulde swyme any water whatsoever.

Thirty-nine persons had bound themselves to pay each a small sum of money (commonly five shillings) to Markham upon the successful accomplishment of the feat. On his return, however, with duly certified proof from the mayor of Berwick, the thirty-nine persons had all "severallye refused to make paymente" of the sums for which they had bound themselves; and Markham prays that they be summoned to appear in court.

A majority of the thirty-nine men who entered into this wager with Markham were actors. (Ten apparently were not;¹ of three others I can find no trace in the records of the drama, although it seems likely that they were obscure members of the theatrical profession.) Accordingly, Mr. Wallace concludes that "these documents unquestionably concern the Gervase Markham of *The Dumb Knight* and *The True Tragedy of Herod and Antipater*"; and he conjectures: "It is possible that we have hitherto erred in ascribing those plays to Gervase Markham, the horseman of Cottam, Nottinghamshire."

But, in view of our present limited knowledge, it seems to me that Mr. Wallace's conclusion and his conjecture are both open to grave doubt. The two documents from the Court of Requests (the first is little more than a list of names, the second a brief statement that Markham's request had been granted) are hardly sufficient in themselves to prove that Markham, the plaintiff in this amusing suit, was "unquestionably" the author of *The Dumb Knight*, written in 1606-7, and of *Herod and Antipater*, written in 1621.² It merely

¹ Including two publishers, Trundle and Gosson; "Henry Sheppey, a turner"; and "William Carpenter, porter at the Marshallsey." Broughton seems to be connected with the law, and the two Keyes possibly kept a tavern, the "Cross Keyes."

² Sir Sidney Lee in the *D.N.B.* says: "Written probably about 1612." This must be a typographical error for 1621. Professor Schelling assigns the play, correctly, I think, to 1621. The title-page of the first edition (1622) says: "As it hath bene, of late, diuers times publiquesly Acted (with great Applause) at the Red Bull, by the Company of his Maiesties Reuels." This company received its license July 8, 1622. Sampson, who collaborated with Markham on the play, was born in 1590. "In 1612," says the *D.N.B.*, "William Sampson, either the dramatist himself, or his father, figured with Thomas and Henry Sampson among the humbler owners of land" in South Leverton, a village near Retford, Nottinghamshire. Later he became a retainer in the family of Sir Henry Willoughby, and with the leisure which this position gave him, was enabled

shows that he secured many actors from the Fortune, the Red Bull, and the Globe to sign his "bill of adventure"; and perhaps we may be warranted in believing that he was personally known to most of them. Again, we cannot be absolutely sure that he was not after all "Gervase Markham, the horseman of Cottam." Let us examine the evidence contained in the documents printed by Mr. Wallace.

(1) The plaintiff describes himself as "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." In 1617, the "horseman," in a signed promise to the booksellers to write no more books "of the Deseases or cures" of horses and cattle of any kind, describes himself similarly as "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." (2) The plaintiff declares that he had "heretofore served his countrye in . . . Ireland and in other Countryes in the place of a Captaine." Of the horseman, the *D.N.B.* says: "In his early years he followed the career of arms in the Low Countries, and had a captaincy under the Earl of Essex in Ireland." (3) The plaintiff says that he is getting old; but he could not have been very old, for he has "many children and great Charge of Househoulde." The horseman, according to the *D.N.B.*, was born "about 1568," and at the time of the suit, therefore, was about fifty-five years of age. (4) The plaintiff is now "soe verye pore that hee is nott able to vndergoe the Charges of any one of those Suites." This description would certainly not apply to the horseman of Cottam in his earlier years, nor is it in keeping with the generally accepted notion of his later years. But, of his pecuniary state in his old age we seem to be ignorant; at least the *D.N.B.* tells us nothing save that about 1605 he "turned to literature in search of the means of subsistence," and became a "hackney writer for the publishers." It is conceivable that when forced to rely upon the generosity of the London booksellers, he fell into poverty, and by 1623 might well describe himself as "verye pore." In 1617 we find him making the following entry in the register of the Stationers' Company:

Memorandum That I Gervase Markham of London gent Do promise hereafter Never to write any more book or bookes to be printed, of the to turn his attention to literature. He collaborated with Markham on *Herod and Antipater*, the first work of his recorded. His next play, *The Widow's Prize*, was written in 1624; his third play, *The Vow Breaker*, was printed in 1636; and in the same year appeared all of his non-dramatic work. I think, therefore, that the evidence for 1621 as the date of *Herod and Antipater* is well-nigh conclusive.

Deseases or cures of any Cattle, as Horse, Oxe, Cowe, sheepe, Swine, and Goates &c. In witnes whereof I have hereunto sett my hand the 14th Day of Julie. 1617.

GERVIS MARKHAM

Now, as the *Cambridge History of English Literature* puts it, "of the many sides of Markham's literary activity, the most prominent, as well as most congenial, was, without doubt, that dealing with horsemanship and the veterinary art"; yet we find him here forced to "completely forswear his especial hobby." Does this document, then, indicate the beginnings of poverty for the industrious compiler of books on animal husbandry? (5) The plaintiff explains that he has "groune pore" in his old age by reason of his "many children and greate Charge of househoulde." Of the horseman, the *D.N.B.* says: "Markham married . . . but no children are recorded." Yet the absence of information on this point is suspicious; for if another "Gervase Markham, of London, gent." had "many children," it is strange that the records of these were not discovered by any competent investigator of the subject.¹

I do not wish, however, to assert that the plaintiff and the horseman are the same person; I merely desire to suggest that such is at least a possibility. For it is surely remarkable that two Gervase Markhams, both describing themselves as "of London, gent.," both of virtually the same age, both having served abroad and in Ireland, both having attained the rank of captain, both subsequently turning to literature for a living, and both having friends among the publishers (two publishers are among the persons cited in the documents), should have lived contemporaneously in London for many years, and yet not hitherto have been distinguished. At least more evidence than we now possess is needed to decide the important question raised by Mr. Wallace.

But there are good reasons, I think, for believing that the famous Markham of Cottam was concerned with *The Dumb Knight*. Machin refers to his collaborator in terms of great respect: "Yet having a partner in the wrong, whose worth hath been often approved, I

¹ I may observe here that the date of death, and the place of burial of Markham of Cottam are now open to doubt, if Mr. Wallace has discovered a new "Gervase Markham, of London, gent.": for the burial entry in St. Giles, Cripplegate ("1636 Feb. 3. Jarvis Markham, Gent.") has been supposed to refer to the horseman for the reason that "as there was only one Jarvis or Gervase Markham, there can be no doubt."

count the wrong but half a wrong, because he knowes best how to answer for himself." These words seem more appropriate as applied to the already illustrious man of letters than to the obscure pedestrian discovered by Mr. Wallace. Nor is Markham's conduct in connection with the play unworthy of the great author of *Cottam*. As I have tried to show, he did not write the play in intimate collaboration with Machin, and was not responsible for the obscene sub-plot; and when the play, after having been adversely criticized in its performance, was printed and offered for sale, he promptly had his name removed from the title-page. There is less evidence that he was connected with the later play, *Herod and Antipater*; yet it is at least worth noting that William Sampson, the collaborator in this play, was, like Markham, a Nottinghamshire man. Less important, but also worth noting, is the fact that Langbaine, in his *English Dramatick Poets* (1691), definitely assigned *Herod and Antipater* to the horseman, and was ignorant of the existence of another playwright by the name of Markham. Finally, if the Markham of *Cottam* did not write *The Dumb Knight* and other plays in blank verse, including *Herod and Antipater*, how are we to explain Jonson's remark about him in his conversations with Drummond?

That Markham (who added his *English Arcadia*¹) was not of the number of the Faithful, *i.e.* *Poets*, and but a base fellow.

It is hardly likely that Jonson at this late date (1619) would notice Markham's early and altogether insignificant poems.

If, however, the mention of poverty and of children in the legal documents is sufficient to warrant us in concluding that the plaintiff in this suit is not to be identified with the Markham of *Cottam*, and if the presence of the names of actors from three playhouses is sufficient to warrant us in believing that the plaintiff was a playwright, we still have to face the possibility that Gervase Markham of *Cottam* wrote *The Dumb Knight* in 1606-7, and that Gervase Markham, the pedestrian, wrote *Herod and Antipater* in 1621. I have not been able to examine this latter play; but in the extensive quotations in Mr. Dunstan's thesis,² I can discover little to suggest the style of

¹ A reference to Markham's *The English Arcadia*, alluding to his beginning from *Sir Phil. Sydnes Ending*, 1607.

² Arthur Cyril Dunstan, *Examination of Two English Dramas*, Königsberg, 1908.

The Dumb Knight. A full and careful study of the play, of course, is necessary to determine this question.

But however the authorship of *Herod and Antipater* may be decided, I must hold that the evidence is reasonably conclusive that Gervase Markham of Cottam was the author of *The Dumb Knight*.

Textual Notes.—Since the opportunity of writing on these two plays has fallen in my way, I desire to record a few textual notes and emendations.

Every Woman

P. 313, ll. 17-19: The words "All hayle to my beloved," and "Sad dispaire doth drive me hence," are the first lines of songs, according to the humor of Philautus, and should therefore be printed in italics, as elsewhere in the play.

P. 322, II. i. 9: "Bindes favours and now discovering lines." Bullen says: "I am unable to mend this passage." Read as follows: "Blinde favours and new discovering lines." That is, Flavia is constantly sending to Lentulus, who loves her not, secret tokens of her affection, and such lines as he reads at the beginning of the scene: "Yours in modestie, *Flavia*."

P. 325, l. 2: "Her fore-amazing person makes me mute." Read "sore-amazing."

P. 328: "The old senate has put on his spectacles." Read: "The old senator," i.e., Flaminius.

Pp. 329-30, l. 24 to the end of the scene: The catchwords are obviously wrong. Read:

Ter. I want one indeede, Wench.

Flav. But thou hast two . . . , etc.

After this to the end of the scene the catchwords should be exchanged. Terentia had two suitors (Lentulus and Cicero), not Flavia; moreover, the wanton language clearly indicates which speeches are to be attributed to Flavia. This change renders Bullen's emendation of the text altogether unnecessary, and provides for his attribution of a part of the last speech to Flavia.

P. 346, l. 3: In the original edition this line has been lost; Mr. Bullen supplies in brackets: "Say, is it Lentulus?" It is more likely that the words were: "What, hath Lentulus——" Cf.

l. 6: "What, hath Terentia——" and l. 10: "What, hath my father——"; and the balancing throughout the whole passage.

P. 359, l. 28: "And then to *Apollo* hollo, trees, hollo." This should be printed as a song (i.e., in italics); Philautus awakes, true to his humor, with a song on his lips.

P. 364, ll. 2-4: "I have no Varlets, no knaves, no stewd prunes, no she fierie phagies." For the last two words read "*fierie facies*." The same pun is made on p. 368: "For hee's [a drunkard is] never without a *fierie facies*."

The Dumb Knight

P. 144, last line: For "cast" read "casts"?

P. 152, ll. 4-7: Beyond all doubt these lines should be given to Epire.

P. 158, l. 6: The modern editor alters the original reading "my" to "thy"; but cf. pp. 133, 151.

P. 162, l. 11: The modern editor alters the original reading, "loves" to "laws"; but the original reading is doubtless correct; cf. the last four lines on p. 144.

P. 180, l. 3: "And I'll defend them [women] against all men, as at single tongue." Omit the word "as."

P. 194, l. 6: The emendation of this line to "My dearest, dreadest, my best sovereign" is quite unnecessary. The original reading (relegated to the footnotes), "My dearest dread, my best, best sovereign," is better meter and better poetry. Cf. Spenser's: "Una, his dear dread."

P. 200, last two lines of the play:

Thus storms bring gentle sunshine, and our hands
May, after shipwreck, bring us to safe lands.

For "our" read "your."

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

CHAUCEr AND THE EARL OF OXFORD

The exact significance of the Earl of Oxford's indorsement upon Chaucer's petition for permission to appoint a permanent deputy in his office of the customs may seem at first glance an unimportant matter. But the interpretation which has been given to it has been used so extensively as evidence for the chronology and interpretation of certain of Chaucer's works that the problem has become one of considerable moment. Professor Tatlock was the first to suggest a particular meaning for Oxford's indorsement.¹ After mentioning the fact that the petition is signed "Oxen*" and inscribed at the top in the same hand "Le Roy lad grante," he wrote: "He [Oxford] clearly had no official connection with Chancery. There is no avoiding the conclusion, therefore, that it was the Earl of Oxford who was Chaucer's sponsor in the matter of the deputy. To judge from Mr. Kirk's note,² he not only signed the petition, but took it in person to the king, who in consequence may have taken an especial interest in the affair. Hence it seems impossible to connect the queen with the appointment of the deputy." In a later work, Professor Tatlock pointed out that this fact removed all necessity for assigning the "Prologue" to *The Legend of Good Women* to 1385,³ and further rejected Bilderbeck's suggestion that *Anelida and Arcite* may be based on Oxford's repudiation of his wife, on the ground that Chaucer had only recently been under obligation to Oxford in the matter of the deputy.⁴ These deductions have been accepted apparently by everyone.⁵ Yet I think it can be shown that this indorsement by the Earl of Oxford indicates no connection with Chaucer at all, but is merely a piece of official business.

¹ "The Dates of Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde* and *Legend of Good Women*," *Modern Philology*, I, 328.

² *Life Records of Chaucer*, IV, 251. The only part of Mr. Kirk's note which concerns Oxford is this: "Signature of the ninth Earl of Oxford with an asterisk. He appears also to have written the words 'Le Roy lad grante,' at the head."

³ *Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works*, p. 121.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁵ Hammond, *Chaucer: A Bibliographical Manual*, pp. 358, 380; Koch, *Englische Studien*, XXXVI, 141; Lowes, *P.M.L.A.* (new series), XII, 670.

In the first place such an indorsement by some member of the Privy Council was essential before a warrant could be issued by Chancery.¹ The legal theories of the time of Richard II held that "no writing expressed the King's command unless accompanied by the impress of the [Great] Seal,"² which was committed to the keeping of the chancellor. Further, no bill was indorsed by the Great Seal on a verbal warrant. Consequently the practice grew up of having some member of the Privy Council indorse the petition with his own signature and a statement of the king's will in the matter. From this indorsement of the petition, Chancery issued the desired warrant. Nearly all the petitions in the *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council* for the reign of Richard II are inscribed and signed in this way.³ In regard to them Sir Harris Nicolas wrote: "The notification of the King's pleasure on the letter or petition submitted to him was always signed, and often written, by some member of the Council, probably by the individual who received His Majesty's commands on the subject."⁴

Not only does Sir Harris Nicolas fail to see any evidence of patronage in these indorsements; but the cases themselves show that the inscriptions and signatures are not evidences of patronage. In one, the Count of Milan seeks redress, in a letter, for some commercial grievances against England: the document is signed by T. Percy, certainly not a patron of the Count of Milan.⁵ In another, the Duke of Exeter (John Holland, half-brother to Richard II), who

¹ Cf. A. V. Dicey, *The Privy Council*, pp. 35 ff.; J. F. Baldwin, "Early Records of the King's Council," *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XII, p. 2.

² Dicey, *op. cit.*

³ Cf. *The Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council*, ed. Sir Harris Nicolas. The petitions of Richard II's reign are in a confused condition. When Nicolas was publishing his collection, he could find no documents earlier than 1587, the year of Oxford's flight. Even for the remaining years of Richard's reign he could discover but a few documents belonging to the Privy Council. Later he himself discovered two documents of Edward III's time, and still more recently Mr. Baldwin has called attention to lately discovered papers of Richard's reign which are as yet unprinted (*Am. Hist. Rev.*, XII, 1 ff.). They were evidently dispersed in various places—Chaucer's, for example, being among the warrants in the office of Chancery. The petitions of Richard's time contained in the *Proceedings* are of the same character as Chaucer's, but usually concern larger matters. Like Chaucer's, they are in most cases addressed to the king; but unlike his, they seem in every case but one to have gone through the hands of the Privy Council. This difference, however, would not affect the rule of indorsing and signing. Cf. Dicey p. 35.

⁴ *Proceedings*, etc., I, xviii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

was in high favor at this time, and himself signing petitions,¹ seeks the income from certain estates: his petition is signed by W. le Scrope, king's chamberlain.² Furthermore, the indorsements in some cases merely instruct the council to look into the merits of the case.³ Finally petitions presented to the *Privy Council only*, and ordinances passed by that body were similarly indorsed by J. Prophete, who, Sir Harris Nicolas thinks, was secretary to that body.⁴

In the second place, the duty of signing petitions seems from early times to have been considered a special part of the function of the king's chamberlain. Among the rules laid down fifty years later (1442) was one which provided that petitions must be countersigned by chamberlain or secretary.⁵ Sir Harris Nicolas stated the usage thus: "The answers to Petitions were commonly, but not always, written at the head, and signed by a Member of the Council, who, in the reign of Henry the Fifth and Sixth, was generally the Chamberlain."⁶ Later he said of the chamberlain: "To him was confided the responsible duty of indorsing upon all Petitions presented to the King, his Majesty's answers."⁷ From the general fact that the development of legal procedure in England has always been one of making long-established customs into fixed law,⁸ we may suppose that this usage, definitely placed in the rules of procedure for the Privy Council in 1442, had been in practice much more than fifty years. Furthermore, we have definite evidence that this was in large measure the case in Richard II's time, in the fact that W. le Scrope and T. Percy, at the time respectively chamberlain and vice-chamberlain, indorsed more petitions than anyone else from 1387-99—and in one document which I shall produce later. From all these facts, then, it seems unquestionable that the indorsement of petitions with a statement of the king's will and the signing of them was a kind of clerical duty incumbent upon members of the Privy Council and especially upon the king's chamberlain.

¹ *Proceedings, etc.*, I, 78.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 87.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, Introduction, p. xvii.

⁵ Dicey, p. 39.

⁶ *Proceedings*, VI, p. ccxiv.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. ccxix.

⁸ Cf. Dicey, *op. cit.*, pp. 30 ff., on development of the power of chancellor.

Now the Earl of Oxford had by inheritance the office of king's chamberlain, and in 1385 he was actually exercising that office.¹ He is mentioned repeatedly in the Patent Rolls of Richard II as king's chamberlain.² And by what can hardly be more than a lucky chance, since reference to indorsements is ordinarily not made in the Patent Rolls, we have clear evidence that in 1385 Oxford was indorsing petitions as part of his business as king's chamberlain. Under date of January 10, 1385, appears this entry:³

Grant, at the request of the king's kinsman, the Earl of Nottingham, that Robert de Selby of Kyngeston-upon-Hull shall be the deputy (*locum tenens*) during good behaviour, of the king's chief butler in that port.

By bill granted by K[ing]; and sealed by the Earl of Oxford, his chamberlain.

Here we have indubitable evidence that Oxford had indorsed the document of a petitioner for whom another noble was sponsor, and that he had done so as part of his business as chamberlain.

Furthermore, and perhaps more conclusive still, the clerks in the office of Chancery did not understand the indorsement on Chaucer's petition as an indication of Oxford's patronage, for they did not mention Oxford as sponsor in the entry on the Patent Rolls.⁴ Yet the Patent Rolls do frequently mention the name of the noble at whose request the patent was issued, for example in the case just quoted and many others that can be found easily by a glance through the Calendars.⁵ Evidently there was some other way of indicating on the petition the name of the sponsor.

Since, then, Oxford, in indorsing Chaucer's position as he did, was merely performing a secretarial act, which was part of his function as an official of the court, and since the clerks who made out Chaucer's warrant apparently did not understand Oxford's signature as an indication of patronage, we must conclude that Oxford's writing upon the petition is not evidence that he was sponsor for the poet in his request.

¹ *Cl. D.N.B.*; *Proceedings*, VI, p. ccxli.

² *E.g.*, 1381-85; pp. 177, 238, 314, 447.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 529.

⁴ *Life Records*, IV, 251.

⁵ For cases in which Oxford himself is indicated as patron, see Patent Rolls, 1381-85, pp. 233, 238, 399.

NOTE

Since the publication of my dissertation, *Chaucer's Official Life*, I have discovered that Professor Tatlock had already identified Chaucer's Bukton as Robert Bukton; see his *Development and Chronology*, pp. 210-11, note. I am very sorry to have missed so important a reference, and can plead in defense only that when I first read Professor Tatlock's book, I had no special interest in Bukton. Later, when my interest in him was awakened, the absence of an index in Professor Tatlock's book made it difficult to discover all that it contained. It unfortunately did not occur to me to look in the chapter on "The Wife of Bath's Prologue and Tale," etc., for information on Bukton. Greatly as I regret having made this blunder, I am glad to find my own deductions confirmed by those of so eminent a scholar as Professor Tatlock.

J. R. HULBERT